THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

THERE are two qualities the combination of which will always produce a great book. These two qualities are thinking which is strenuous, clear-sighted and honest, and devotion which is intense, constant and personal to Jesus Christ. These two qualities meet in the most notable way in Dr. Nels F. S. FERRÉ's book *Christ and the Christian*.[1]

If we are to study Christ, where shall we make our beginning? It might be claimed that we should begin with *experience*. After William Adams Brown had finished a week of lectures on Christ, he was startled to be asked: 'But what does Jesus mean to you personally?'—a fair question. The difficulty with experience is that 'it is generally organized by the self in the interest of the self'. And, therefore, 'the sinful self cleverly distorts the picture of Christ'. It might be claimed that we should begin with the *Bible*, which contains the records of the primary facts, and which is used by all denominations and Christian groups. The trouble with the Bible for this purpose is twofold. First, 'we read the Bible *through the theology* we hold'. And, therefore, different people will produce quite different interpretations of precisely the same material within it. Second, the Bible has in fact no one Christology. It has at least five interpretations of Jesus. (1) Jesus was Messiah (Ac 10^{38}). (2) Jesus was God, as Thomas called Him, and as the Book of Revelation consistently implies in its application to Him of the attributes and descriptions of God, and as statements such as Col 1^{19} and 2^{29} could be used to argue. (3) Jesus was Logos as John said, 'the outgoing Godhood in creative and communicative relations'. (4) Jesus was the firstborn among many creatures or of all creation. In this view Jesus is on the side of creation, not of the Creator (cf. Col 1^{15}). (5) Jesus was the adopted Son of God (He $1^{4.5}$). It might be claimed that we should begin with *the great Councils*, of which four are decisive for Christology. Nicaea is 'the bedrock affirmation that in Jesus Christ we meet the only, true and full deity'. The First Council of Constantinople settles the full humanity of Jesus, as against the mistaken reverence and devotion of Apollinaris who held that Jesus must have had deity for *nous* or mind. Chalcedon settled the unity of Jesus' personality. He was Son of God and Son of Man yet He was 'one true historical personality'. The Sixth Ecumenical Council settled the question of 'the permanence of the two natures within the one personality'. The human is not lifted into Godhood, or the Godhood lowered into humanity. 'The humanity of Jesus remains inviolably human'. It is quite true that the Councils give, at least formally, the centre of Christian truth, and no man can totally depart from them and remain an orthodox Christian.

But Dr. FERRÉ insists that the real place to start is with Christ Himself, and with Christ as *agapē*. This is the Event-Meeting which explains our experience, reveals and judges our sin, and fully offers final salvation. This is 'the co-ordinating context for all events'. 'The Christ who is *agapē* is the eternal Word by which all other words are interpreted and put in their proper place.'

We should like now briefly—and necessarily inadequately—to summarize Dr. FERRÉ's extremely important chapter on 'The Atonement'. There are three kinds of theories of the Atonement which are basically wrong. (1) Those which presuppose that God is not through and through *agapē*. Even the use of the formula 'for Jesus' sake' would sometimes make one 'think that it was a magic formula to make God do something that He otherwise would not or could not do'. It is *God* who has saved us—through His Son. As P. T. Forsyth said, the Cross does not *procure* grace; it *bestows* grace. God is not Himself too holy to deal redemptively with sin. (2) The kind of theory which forfeits the 'rightful and necessary place of law'. Law can never be by-passed; it can only be abolished by being fulfilled. 'Atonement is the gateway to such fulfilment of the Law.' 'Any theory that sells sin short and weighs law light is false.' No theory which abolishes law and even abolishes the consequences of sin can be right. It is essential to remember

[1] Collins; 12s. 6d. net.

that God assumes man's sin and pays for it and cancels it *from within humanity*. 'Sin has to be broken from within the law. . . . The law has to be fulfilled by the violator'. And that is why a full and serious doctrine of Incarnation, the enmanning of God, is essential. (3) The kind of doctrine that teaches to the effect that God does for us what we should do for ourselves 'thus stunting our moral growth and keeping us immature'. Atonement does not mean by-passing the law but fulfilling the law; it means that God, through incarnation, enables men to do for themselves that which is needed for true righteousness and the fullest possible moral maturity.

Is there, then, any element of substitution in the Atonement? Dr. FERRÉ insists that there can be no life at all without substitution. For example, no man and no generation have to begin at the beginning of knowledge. They enter into an accumulation of what others have done and learned. Life is bound to be substitute experience; it depends on this vicariousness. Even from the point of view of morals we enter into a series of social forces which 'surround and interpenetrate the very forms of thinking, knowing, choosing, growing'. We are necessarily involved in community, and therefore necessarily in substitution. Sin must always involve individual choice; and yet even here there is 'a social stream of sin'—which is the real sense of original sin—into which we all by experience enter. It is precisely with this human situation which is basically and essentially substitutionary that Jesus, and God in Jesus, identified Himself.

Dr. FERRÉ asks the question, What happened on Calvary? He begins by seeing Jesus in terms of example. Jesus is our example of *obedience* and 'there can be no salvation at all for us until we learn to take up our Cross and follow Christ'. He is our example of *faith*. Faith is not merely belief about God; 'faith is the presence of God in our lives'. He is the example of *humility*. He fully accepted the God who seeks no glory 'but whose glory is to bestow glory'. He was given the name which is above every name precisely because He was never concerned about His own name. He is the example of *love*. Here we are confronted with something of vast and uplifting importance. Atonement means that we, too, must walk the way of Christ; and, therefore, 'unless we become ambassadors of the living Christ . . . we have never tasted the reality of atonement. . . . Atonement demands that those who accept God's Christ-deed for them join the Christ in His conflict unto death.' Atonement matters essentially, operationally to life. Our humanity must become 'the means whereby God finds a way to man'. 'We must offer our lives to be crucified with the Saviour. As Luther declares, we must become saviours to others'. Seldom has any theologian confronted his readers so vividly with the responsibility as well as the privilege of atonement.

But example is not enough; in Jesus Christ there is not only light, there is power. Dr. FERRÉ is not afraid of the language which talks of 'the blood'. To him the blood of God is 'the purity, grace, strength and suffering of God, wherein alone we can be saved'. The function of the blood is 'to nourish, cleanse, heal and keep in balance', and that is what this blood of God does in us and for us.

Inevitably this brings us face to face with the idea of sacrifice. The wrong way to look on sacrifice in Christ is to look on it as 'placating the wrath of God'. Still less is the sacrifice made to satisfy any devil. The sacrifice is the sacrifice of 'the eternally outgoing love of God', which participates in man's plight and finds a way out of it. God makes Himself conversant with man's sin and suffering and sorrow *from within man*, thus bringing to man in man the victory. 'Because God Himself is in man, man, in right relation to God, can do what man apart from such personal presence of God cannot do.'

'Only by keeping man real as man and doing for and in himself what is right can we have a moral theory of the Atonement.' That is why the whole stress is on Incarnation, *God in man*; and that is why the Atonement is a means, not an end, a means whose end is the community of the redeemed.

Dr. FERRÉ quotes a saying of Jean Nicholas Grou: 'Here we have matter for contemplation for all eternity, and all that we shall think of it and all that we shall say of it in heaven will be infinitely less than the truth'. That is profoundly true, but Dr. FERRÉ has brought us into living contact with the truth. This is not a book for the leisure moment or the easy chair. Sentence after sentence and paragraph after paragraph have to be read repeatedly before the meaning becomes clear, not because the style is difficult but because the thought is so pregnant; but the toil of reading this book is infinitely worth while.

Human values—the true, the good and the beautiful—are a problem for Christian thought.

It cannot ignore them, for all life is under God, depending on Him and subject to Him. Metaphysical, ethical and aesthetic values cannot therefore be disregarded. On the other hand, these values must be handled warily for they are peculiarly liable to an idolatrous perversion. Again and again in history men have in effect equated the Holy with the true, the good or the beautiful. Any such tendency the Christian thinker must resist, yet not with an absolute negative, for the very things which the natural mind makes the objects of its idolatrous worship become, for the mind of faith, instruments in God's service. Through Christ God has redeemed all things to Himself, the true, the good and the beautiful included.

It is the great merit of a book first published in America and recently made available on this side of the Atlantic—*Human Culture and the Holy*, by Professor Jaroslav PELIKAN, B.D., Ph.D.[1]—that it handles these important insights not abstractly but in relation to six men who have in their several ways illuminated one or other aspect of the relation between Christianity and the problem of values. The name of Kierkegaard is used to stress the realization that the equation of the Holy and the true has been a dangerous and insidious heresy; that of Dostoevsky to proclaim the distinctiveness of the Holy as a reality far transcending the morally good; and that of Nietzsche to illumine the startling truth that the identification of the Holy and the beautiful may be demonic, a subtle mask for the will-to-power. To these three men the realization of the impossibility of equating the Holy with one or other human value came in the clarity of mind and singleness of heart that are the gift of the insane.

It is the thinker and the theologian who are likely to identify the Holy and the true and thus become guilty of intellectualism; it is the average man who is likely to identify the Holy and the good and thus become diverted into moralism; but the subtlest way in which men have sought to domesticate God or turn Him into a value has been the way of the aesthete who has found within the fascination which the beautiful holds for men an explanation of the fascination of the Holy.

Over against the three men named above our author sets other three men, St. Paul, Luther and J. S. Bach, who were also drawn to an equation of the Holy with one or other of these values, but came to realize that God cannot thus be domesticated in a value, but that to the Holy all values must be subjected. Moreover this second trio may be adduced as proof that an understanding of the great human values is one of the things which is added to us if we seek first the kingdom of the Holy One. If we identify the Holy and the human values we fail to do justice even to the values which we worship; but if we interpret the values in terms of the Holy One from whom they proceed, we lose our lives for Christ's sake and the gospel's and therefore find them. Paul, finding truth in Christ and submitting to the Holy in Christ could proclaim a Lord whose rule was wide enough to include all reality and all truth. Luther, realizing that the Holy and the good are not identical, could triumphantly proclaim that in the forgiveness of sins the Holy gave the good to men as a gift. Bach, rejecting the holiness of beauty for the beauty of holiness and rejecting the idea that exposure to any of the arts, however beautiful, could be expected to change man, bore witness through his life and work to the conviction that man could not live by beauty any more than by bread alone, but only by the Word that proceeded from the mouth of God. Yet he bore witness also to the truth that the adoration of the Holy is the adoration of Him who is Creator, Redeemer and Lord of all life, Him who can be praised in secular concertos as in church chorales.

The Holy is not the sublimely true, the highest good, the ultimately beautiful. It cannot be comprehended within man's systems of thought or categories of ethics or representations of the beautiful. It eludes every human effort to tame it or take it captive. Yet the Holy has been made flesh and has dwelt among us in Jesus Christ. Dedicating themselves completely to the Holy, submitting themselves and their values to the lordship of Christ, these three men became 'fools for Christ' and thereby entered into true wisdom.

Perhaps there is a message in all this for many of our contemporaries who seek a genuine experience of God, whether their approach be intellectual, through philosophy and theology, or moral, through conscience and the system of ethics, or aesthetic, through the manifold expression of the arts. They need to be warned that the values are not God and cannot be fit objects of worship. Yet the God whom faith has come to know as the God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ lays His claim upon everything in life, including the true, the good and the beautiful. They are not He, but they witness to Him and serve Him and are to be viewed in terms of His sovereignty.

[1] S.C.M.; 15s. net.

Great Themes of the New Testament

IV. Acts ii. 14–40

By the Reverend William Barclay, D.D., The University of Glasgow

It would scarcely be an exaggeration to claim that Acts is the most important history book in the world, for without it we would know nothing about the history of the Early Church and the beginnings of the Christian religion, apart from what we could deduce and piece together from the Letters of Paul. And within Acts this passage which we are about to study must rank high in interest, for it is the record of the first sermon preached in the Christian Church.

No sooner have we said that than we face a problem, which we cannot evade, and about which there will be no unanimous agreement. In this and in other speeches in Acts have we an accurate and reliable account of what the preachers and speakers really said? Are Luke's versions of these sermons and speeches to be accepted as something in the nature of verbatim reports? Or, are they to be regarded as inventions or compositions by Luke himself? Or, are they to be regarded as based on sound tradition, although edited by Luke and stamped with the impress of his mind and style?

The factor which makes this so real a question is the ancient method of writing history. Ancient historians had a habit of liberally intermingling their narrative with speeches. In every crisis of history, when great decisions had to be taken, or great issues were at stake, the ancient historians supplied a speech by one of the chief actors in events. In the thirty-five extant books of Livy's history there are about four hundred speeches. One third of the history of Dionysius of Halicarnassus consists of speeches, and one fifth of the history of Thucydides. And none of these historians even pretended that the speeches which they inserted into their histories had any real connexion with anything which was actually said.

The supreme master of the historical speech was Thucydides, and the standard exposition and examination of them is that by R. C. Jebb in the volume of essays entitled *Hellenica*. Thucydides sets out his own method in the speeches: 'As to the various speeches made on the eve of the war, or in its course, I have found it difficult to retain a memory of the precise words which I had heard spoken, and so it was with those who brought me reports. But I have made the persons say what it seemed to me most opportune for them to say in view of each situation; at the same time I have adhered as closely as possible to the general sense of what was actually said. As to the deeds done in war, I have not thought myself at liberty to record them on hearsay from the first informant, or on arbitrary conjecture. My account rests either on personal knowledge, or on the closest possible scrutiny of each statement made by others. The process of research was laborious, because conflicting accounts were given by those who had witnessed the several events, as partiality swayed or memory served them' (Thucydides, i. 21). Thucydides is perfectly frank about the method he followed. In regard to events he followed a policy of meticulous sifting and scrutinizing of his sources; in regard to the speeches he allowed himself free composition, based on what it was appropriate for the speaker to say, and on any reminiscences of the speech which were available. He certainly never intended the speeches to be taken as verbatim reports. In his essay on how history ought to be written Lucian lays down the principle: 'If ever it is necessary to introduce any one who will deliver an address, see to it that the words are specially appropriate to the character of the speaker and relevant to the situation; further, that they are as clear as possible. But at such a time you are permitted to play the orator, and to exhibit your rhetorical skill' (Lucian, *On How History Should Be Written*, 58). To Lucian historical speeches were essays in rhetoric rather than results of research.

The situation was in actual practice more serious than that. Few historians confined themselves within the limits of the restraint and moderation of the principles of Thucydides. Even when the original speeches were available, they still preferred to put into the mouths of the speakers speeches which were their own compositions and inventions. The speech of Cæsar to his soldiers is quite different in the history of Dio Cassius (xxxviii. 36–46) from Cæsar's own version of it (*B.G.*, i. 40). The speech of Claudius as reported by Tacitus (*Annals*, ii. 24) is quite

different from the version on the original brass tablet found at Lyons (*Corpus Inscript. Latin.*, xiii. 1668). Moreover, from the literary point of view, it was these speeches which were reckoned the outstanding parts of the histories. Demosthenes studied the speeches in the history of Thucydides, and Quintilian praised those in the history of Livy. Even a Jewish historian like Josephus largely adopted this practice. Josephus, for instance, provides a long speech by Potiphar's wife when she had failed to seduce Joseph (Josephus, *Antiquities*, II. iv. 3–5).

The only ancient historian who repudiated this custom was Polybius. 'Surely,' he writes, 'an historian should not aim at producing speeches which might have been delivered, nor study dramatic propriety in details like a writer of tragedy; but his function is above all to record with fidelity what was actually said or done, however commonplace it may be. For the purposes of history and drama are not the same' (Polybius, ii. 56). He severely censures Timaeus because he did not set down the actual words of speeches, or even the drift of them, but 'imagining how they ought to have been expressed, he enumerates all the arguments used, like a schoolboy declaiming on a set theme' (Polybius, xii. 25a). R. C. Jebb quotes Voltaire: 'Set speeches are a sort of oratorical lie, which the historian used to allow himself in old times. He used to make his heroes say what they might have said. . . . At the present day these fictions are no longer tolerated. If one put into the mouth of a prince a speech which he had never made, the historian would be regarded as a rhetorician.'

All this presents us with a very real problem, and a problem which we must solve before we can speak of our present passage as the first recorded sermon of the Christian Church. Did Luke follow the normal historical convention of his day and generation, and are the speeches and sermons in Acts no more than Luke's composition and free invention? Or, had Luke sources and traditions which he followed, and are we entitled to regard the speeches and sermons as trustworthy and reliable accounts of what was said on the occasions which they represent? Few would go so far as to claim that they are verbatim reports. It would be impossible for any one to deny that Luke edited them, and left the impress of his own style on them all. But do they at least give the substance of what was said?

There are many scholars who believe that Luke was following the normal convention of his age. Foakes-Jackson writes: 'The student of classical literature will find it difficult to believe that they are not compositions of the writer' (*Acts*, p. xvi). Jülicher regards them as free inventions. If they fit the occasion, if Peter is more Judaistic in his alleged speeches than Paul, if Paul's alleged material differs to suit the occasion, that proves no more than that Luke had good literary taste and sound historical imagination. After all, no other Christian was present during Paul's speech at Athens, nor at his private conversations with Felix, Festus, and Agrippa. Where then could any record have come from? (*Introduction to the New Testament*, Eng. tr., 443, 444). H. J. Cadbury concludes: 'The elaborate, homogeneous and schematic speeches suggest, if not the rhetoric, at least the free composition of the speeches in the Greek and Roman historians' (*Beginnings of Christianity*, ii. 15). True, this does not take everything away, for even then it can be held that the speeches 'indicate at least what seemed to a well-informed Christian of the next generation the main outline of the Christian message as first presented by Jesus' followers in Palestine and in the cities of the Mediterranean world' (*Beginnings of Christianity*, v. 247).

Is the evidence for such a view such that we cannot do other than agree to it, or, are there reasons which entitle us to go beyond that view? F. H. Chase in *The Credibility of the Book of the Acts of the Apostles* does present a case for going further; and in what follows we use and add to his arguments.

In New Testament times it would never be safe to say what could and what could not be remembered. It must never be forgotten that in those days the printed book did not exist, and that manuscript rolls were scarce and expensive, and that, therefore, if a man wished to possess a poem, a speech, or a story he had to remember it. Xenophon's Niceratus says: 'My father, wishing me to grow up into a good man, made me learn all the lines of Homer; and now I can repeat the whole of the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* from memory' (Xenophon, *Symposium*, iii. 5). It is what Chase calls 'a supercilious forgetfulness' which fails to remember that the ancients were not altogether without certain modern accessories. Shorthand certainly existed, and Galen (xix. 11 [ed. Kuhn]) tells us that his medical students took down his lectures in some kind of shorthand. Note-taking is not a modern achievement. It is to be remembered that the East is 'naturally meditative', and the sermons and speeches of the leaders of the Early Church would be turned over and over in the mind. The Jew made much more than the Greek of the actual wording of teaching as the essential vehicle of the thought of the speaker, and would be much more likely to remember it. It is of first-class importance to remember that whatever tradition is behind the speeches and sermons, if there is one, would be a communal

tradition. It would certainly not be a case of material being dependent on the memory of one or two persons; the memory behind it is the memory of the Church. And further, the sermons and speeches of the leaders of the Church were not something to be listened to, but something to be acted upon, and must, therefore, have been stored in the memory and repeatedly discussed. It is a matter of fact that a man does not readily forget the sermon by which he was converted.

It is not without significance, as Chase points out, that the sermons of Peter in Acts are curiously Jewish. The phrase 'the whole house of Israel' occurs nowhere else in the New Testament, but is part of the Jewish *Kaddish* prayer (Ac 2^{36}). Acts 3^{13} is actually the first phrase of the great Jewish prayer, the *Shemoneh Esreh*, which a devout Jew prayed three times a day. 'Sons of the covenant' in Ac 3^{25} is a characteristically Jewish phrase. If this is all invention, it is very subtle invention indeed. A feature of Acts is the difference between the Western and the Neutral texts, and it is a fact that the difference between these two texts is least in the speeches.

As for sources, for Paul's speeches Luke had Paul himself, and for the others, though he cannot have heard them, he must have been in close contact with many who did. Torrey's theory that behind Ac 1^{1}-15^{36} there lies an Aramaic original source has not found universal acceptance, but it is a notable fact that most of the alleged Aramaisms in fact come from the speeches, which would seem to show that they do have an Aramaic source behind them.

We believe that the conclusion must be that the speeches in Acts are not entirely free compositions and rhetorical inventions by Luke, but that, though edited by him, and though no doubt owing much to his hand, they do go back to a sound and reliable tradition, and that, therefore, in the case of our present passage we are justified in regarding it as containing the substance of the first recorded sermon in the Christian Church.

It may well be that Luke underlines the importance of Peter's sermon by the word with which he introduces it. He says that Peter lifted up his voice and *said* unto them. The Greek for *said* is *ἀπεφθέγξατο*. This word occurs in only two other places in the New Testament, in Ac 2^{4}, where it describes the utterance of the Christians under the influence of the Holy Spirit, and in Ac 26^{25} where Paul claims before Agrippa and Festus that he is *speaking forth* the words of truth and soberness. It is used of plainly stating one's opinion; but, more, it is used of the memorable utterances of wise men and philosophers; it is used of oracular utterances (Lucian, *Alexander*, 25); it is used by Vettius Valens in close conjunction with *μανιώδης* and *ἐκστατικός* (see Moulton and Milligan, *Vocabulary of the Greek Testament*). The Grimm-Thayer *Lexicon* lays it down that the word 'belongs to dignified and elevated discourse', and Arndt and Gingrich give it as 'the word of the wise man, the oracle-giver, the diviner, the prophet, the exorcist, and other "inspired" persons'. There is little doubt that Luke chose this word to indicate that an apostolic sermon—as every sermon ought to be—was not the expression of one man's opinions, but the utterance of a message from God mediated by the Holy Spirit. What, then, is this message and announcement of Peter?

It begins with the joyous announcement that something has happened, something which is the fulfilment of the hopes and dreams and expectations of the prophets. The Jews saw time divided into two ages. There was *this present age*, which was wholly bad, and wholly under the domination of evil, and there was *the age to come*, which was to be wholly good, the golden age, the age of God and of His Kingdom. How was the one age to change into the other? That change could not come by human effort and human reformation; it could only come by the direct intervention and the direct action of God. The day on which God would intervene was known as the Day of the Lord. In effect, Peter says: The Day of the Lord has come; eternity has invaded time; God has acted; the old order has ended and the new order has begun. To prove his point and his assertion Peter quotes from Jl 2^{28-32}. That which the prophet has dreamed of and foretold has found its fulfilling. The events of Pentecost are that very outpouring of the Spirit which the prophet foretold. It may well be that Peter saw the fulfilment of the prediction that the sun would be turned into darkness and the moon into blood in murky darkness which came upon Jerusalem during the Crucifixion (Mt 27^{45}, Mk 15^{33}, Lk 23^{44}).

The variations in the text of the quotation make a fascinating and a most suggestive study. First, there are the alterations made, according to the Neutral Text, in the quotation. In Joel the passage begins *after these things* (*καὶ ἔσται μετὰ ταῦτα*), that is, after the terrible plague of locusts described in the earlier part of the chapter. B retains this reading; but the other main uncials agree that Peter altered this into *in the last days* (*ἔσται ἐν ταῖς ἐσχάταις ἡμέραις*). That is to say, Peter by this slight but definite alteration makes it clear that he sees in Jesus Christ and in the events of Pentecost the last times, the inbreak of God, the emergence of the new age. Further, the words *and they shall prophesy* in *v.*18 are not part of the Joel quotation, and are, indeed, omitted in D. This stressing of this outbreak of prophecy,

and this universalising of the ability to prophesy is very significant. There is a midrash on Ps 14^6 (57 b): 'Rabbi Levi said. . . . the Master is God who said, "O that they had such a heart as to fear me" (Dt 5^{29}); the pupil is Moses who said, "O that all the Lord's people were prophets" (Nu 11^{29}); but neither the words of the Master nor of the Pupil find fulfilment in this world, but in the future the words of both will find fulfilment, the words of the Master for "I will give you a new heart" (Ezk 36^{26}), and the words of the Pupil for "I will pour out my spirit upon all flesh" (Jl 2^{28})'. This is to say that only in the heavenly age would this gift of universal prophecy come to men. The very stressing of the universality of the prophetic gift is another claim that heaven has invaded earth in the coming of Jesus and the descent of His Spirit.

But in some ways the alterations of the Western Text in D are even more significant. The Neutral Text is that God will pour out His spirit *ἐπὶ πᾶσαν σάρκα*, on all flesh; D has *ἐπὶ πάσας σάρκας* literally, on all flesh. Further, instead of *οἱ υἱοὶ καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες ὑμῶν*, your sons and your daughters, D has *οἱ υἱοὶ αὐτῶν καὶ αἱ θυγατέρες αυτῶν*, *i.e.*, their sons and daughters. Of the purpose of this there is no doubt. It is to remove the last vestiges of nationalism from the prophecy, and to insist that the promise was made to the whole wide world, and that in Jesus Christ the promise to the whole wide world has been fulfilled.

The first sentence of the actual message of the first Christian sermon was the affirmation that something has happened. It is not the hope that something will happen, not even the promise of things to come. It is the statement that the last days have come, that eternity has broken in on time, that God has acted as He always said that He would act, that the promised Messianic age has come. Things which are possible only in the heavenly age are happening; the Messianic events are unfolding themselves before the very eyes of men. And further, even at the very beginning, there were implications which at the moment were not seen, but which were bound to work themselves out. There was the implication that any bonds which limited the promises of God to some most favoured nation were burst and broken, and that, as the Western Text even labours to underline, this outpouring of Divine life is for all men of all nations. It is well to remember that the Christian preaching began with the announcement of an act of God for all men.

We may here note another fact about the beginning of this first sermon. It is of the greatest significance that the sermon opens with a quotation from prophecy, and that it continues to use prophecy all the way through. It may be that the citation and the quotation of prophecy is nowadays a method of presenting the Christian message which for many has lost its impressiveness. But the very fact that there can be such a thing as prophecy indicates a certain view of history. If there can be such a thing as prophecy, it necessarily means that in history there is plan and purpose, that history is not a meaningless succession of chance and unrelated events, but that it is going somewhere, and is under some direction.

The Stoics believed that history was an eternal repetition of the same things. Chrysippus sets out the theory that at certain fixed periods of time there comes a universal conflagration which destroys the cosmos, and then everything begins again in precisely the same way. 'Socrates and Plato and each individual man will live again, with the same friends and fellow-citizens. They will go through the same experiences and the same activities . . . And this restoration of the universe takes place not once, but over and over again—to all eternity without end . . . There will never be any new thing other than that which has been before, but everything is repeated to the minutest detail.' History to the Stoic was an ever-repeated cycle from which there is no escape. G. N. Clark in his Inaugural Lecture at Cambridge insisted that there is no secret and no plan discoverable in history. 'I do not believe that any future consummation could make sense of all the irrationalities of the preceding ages. If it could not explain, still less could it justify them.' Herbert Fisher said: 'Men wiser and more learned than myself have discerned in history a plot, a rhythm, a pre-determined pattern. I can see only one emergency following upon another, as wave follows upon wave.' André Maurois wrote: 'The universe is indifferent. Who created it? Why are we here on this puny mud heap spinning in infinite space? I have not the slightest idea, and I am convinced that no one has the slightest idea.'

There are many voices to proclaim what they believe to be the senselessness of history. The very fact that the first Christian sermon begins with a quotation from prophecy is the affirmation of faith that behind the kaleidoscope of events there is the unfolding purpose of God. (*To be continued*)

Apostolic Succession[1]

By Professor C. K. Barrett, D.D., the University of Durham

This is not an original contribution to scienitfic history or scientific theology, but a short account of what English Free Churchmen ought to know about a vexed and vexing subject. It is a paper which was read, at their request, to a united meeting of the Free Church Societies in the Durham Colleges (Durham University). After the meeting I was strongly pressed to publish what I had said. I now do so in the hope that it may be useful to a wider audience. In such narrow compass there is no room either to mince one's words, or to provide the apparatus of scholarship to support one's arguments; but I have never willingly been uncharitable, and I am prepared to produce the necessary support for every statement.

1. *Why is it necessary to talk about 'Apostolic Succession'?* Because, for good or ill, it is a cardinal point in every scheme for reunion or inter-communion that has ever been put before us. It is important that Free Churchmen should be clear on this point. The requests made to us by the Church of England have never been reduced to the simple requirement that those whom we call moderators, chairmen, or what not, should simply be described by a new title—bishops. When, in this context, Anglicans speak of the episcopate it is always the 'historic episcopate', the episcopate that stands in the 'succession', that they mean. It is of course true that there are Anglicans who no more believe in the 'historic episcopate' than Free Churchmen do; but their attitude is not that which determines the 'foreign policy' of the Church of England. What this is, is made evident by the fact that the Church of England is in communion with the bishops of the Old Catholic Church, and with the bishops of the Church of Sweden, who all are in the 'apostolic succession', but is not in communion with the bishops of the Church of Norway, or of the German Evangelical Church, who, though they accept the same fundamental confessional documents as their Lutheran brethren in Sweden, are not in the succession.

It is evident that those who act on these lines believe that the apostolic succession is a primary mark of the Church. Every Church is justified in withholding the privilege of inter-communion with itself from any body which it deems to be no true Church of Jesus Christ—indeed, it is its duty so to do. But when bodies showing orthodoxy in faith, integrity in Christian practice, and even possessing, some of them, an episcopal ministry, but lacking the succession, are denied inter-communion, we are bound to conclude that those who insist upon this condition believe that without it true churchmanship is impossible.

2. *What does 'Apostolic Succession' mean?* It means that within the historic 'succession' there exists a direct continuity which links the bishops of the present with the apostles and thereby guarantees the orthodoxy of the Church's faith and the efficacy of its sacraments. The crudest expression of this belief is often called the 'pipe-line' theory of the succession. This theory is, that at each episcopal consecration, when hands are laid upon the new bishop's head, grace is communicated from the consecrator to the consecrand; this grace descends—by a sort of spiritual pipe-line—from the apostles, and without it no man can execute the bishop's office. This crude formulation of the theory of apostolic succession is to-day often disowned but it is very hard to see what those who insist upon the succession have to put in its place. They cannot mean simply a respect for the past, and a willingness to learn from the earlier ages of Christian history; these are clearly not dependent on the succession. They cannot mean a purely general sense of continuity with the past. They must (so far as I can see) mean that real continuity in the Church exists only in continuity of episcopal consecrations; that is, that it really is possible to trace a line of consecrating and ordaining hands from the present to the time of the apostles, who consecrated successors, who consecrated successors, who consecrated successors, and so on. And through this process there descends to those modern bishops who are in the succession, and to them only, something—and no one can define exactly what it is—which makes the Church the Church.

3. *Does the 'Apostolic Succession' in fact do what is claimed for it?* There is one point here which it is impossible to discuss. We cannot argue whether or not the succession guarantees sacramental grace—or at least we could do so logically only if we had grounds for denying the efficacy of the sacraments observed in Churches which have the succession. This, I take it, none of us has any desire to do. For my own part I am entirely satisfied that the sacraments of the

[1] In the May number a reply by Dr. J. G. Davies of the University of Birmingham will appear.

Church of England are valid and efficacious (whatever exactly that phrase may mean). But to say this carries with it logically neither an affirmation nor a denial of the effectiveness of the succession. The sacraments may be efficacious *because* of the succession, or *in spite* of the succession, or sacraments and succession may have nothing to do with each other. We can prove nothing one way or the other. What, of course, Free Churchmen know is that their own sacraments, with no succession to 'guarantee' them, are complete and proper sacraments in every sense.

We are on firmer ground in considering the question whether apostolic succession guarantees orthodox belief. The answer cannot be disputed; it guarantees no such thing. It would suffice to appeal to antiquity. All the bishops who contended so bitterly against one another in the doctrinal controversies of the ancient Church were in the succession (if anyone ever has been), and the successors of some of them remain in heresy to this day. But we need not be content with antiquity. The bishops of the pre-Reformation period may all be supposed to have been in the succession; but this did not prevent some of them from pushing and profiting by the sale of indulgences—nay, from sheer paganism and profligacy. If we turn to the present day we must tread carefully; but he would be a bold man who would represent all twentieth-century Anglican bishops as staunch upholders of Nicene orthodoxy; and, of course, many Anglicans would join us in the view that Rome itself is a heretical Church.

There is one other end which the 'historic episcopate' is supposed to achieve for us. It, and it alone, we are told, holds out the prospect of a universally recognised ministry. But does it? The Eastern Churches and Rome have each of them the historic episcopate; but they are not united. Rome does not recognise Canterbury. Free Churchmen, who have no historic episcopate to tie their hands, are glad to recognise mutually the ministries of their respective Churches; it is the Churches with the succession who stand out in splendid isolation.

4. *Does the 'Apostolic Succession' exist?* The answer to this question is, we do not know. It is not impossible that an apostle should before his death have appointed someone to succeed him in the ministry, and that this successor should have appointed a successor, and so on. It is not impossible that such a succession should have lasted to the present day. But if such a succession does exist, no one knows *that* it exists, or *where* it exists, for the simple reason that there is no evidence. Over wide areas the story is plain enough, for the Church, by the mercy of God, has had a continuous existence. But at the crucial points the evidence breaks down. One crucial point is the Reformation period; and, as I have already said, Rome does not believe that the Church of England kept the succession. This is an issue which Roman and Anglican controversialists may be allowed to dispute; but I think that if I seriously wanted the succession I should probably feel compelled to go to Rome for it. The most vital point of all is the link between the apostles and the next generation, and here, as over much of the century that followed the deaths of the apostles, we are in the dark. There is an ambiguous, and probably corrupt, sentence in the Epistle of Clement of Rome; but in the New Testament itself there is no support whatever for the theory. The apostles themselves did not hold the theory of apostolic succession.

I must emphasise here that it is not enough that the succession should seem probable, or should cover *most* of the ground. If it cannot be proved *certain*, and to cover *all* the ground, it dissolves into mere respect for antiquity, which is neither here nor there.

John Wesley said that the 'Apostolic Succession' was a fable. He was right.

5. *Ought the 'Apostolic Succession' to exist?* In other words, is the fable a good and edifying fable (like some of the legends about the saints), or is it a harmful fable?

Here I must begin by repeating from the theological angle what I have already said from the historical. The apostolic literature of the New Testament is completely silent about the apostolic succession. This means that, to all who regard the Bible as the Word of God and the supreme authority in and over the Church, it is impossible to regard the apostolic succession as central to the Christian faith; moreover, to represent it as central and essential is to do dishonour to Scripture, for if it is indeed so important a matter that the lack of it is sufficient to unchurch millions of believers, then the silence of Scripture can only be described as an unpardonable oversight on the part of the Holy Spirit.

This, however, is a negative attitude to the subject, and there is more to say.

(a) The New Testament gives a unique place to the apostles, and their uniqueness does not lie in administrative authority—an episcopal ministry—but in the fact that they can speak as eye-witnesses, especially of the resurrection of Jesus. This is truly a unique privilege and responsibility, and one which the apostles could not have transmitted to successors if they had wished to do so. Blessed, indeed, are they that have not seen, yet have believed; but they have not *seen*, and they can therefore neither usurp nor inherit the place of the original eye-witnesses. In their *essential*

office, the apostles did not have successors because they could not have them.

(b) The New Testament finds authority not in the persons of the apostles, but in their message. Paul is ready to pronounce himself accursed if he should turn to a different gospel (Gal 1^{8}). It is the gospel that matters ; the person of the preacher is a secondary matter.

(c) The New Testament, by establishing the freedom of God to act in grace, makes it impossible to believe that men can guarantee their relation with Him by means of a succession, however venerable. This the Jews, the descendants of Abraham, had essayed to do ; and this was the seed that flowered in their rejection of Christ. Christians who re-erect a new succession fall back into Judaism and away from Christ, for they are refusing to take seriously the New Testament requirement that we live *by faith*.

6. *What positive truths can we learn from this false doctrine* ? We in the Free Churches have much to learn from those who are concerned that the Church shall be no free-lance affair, a club for those who like to practise their religion in a certain way. If we are not the Church that Jesus Christ founded in the apostles, we are not the Church, however many religious and pious acts we may perform.

Secondly, we should learn true apostolicity from the doctrine of the apostles which they have left behind for us in the New Testament. There is no need to exercise patience with the man who complains of the ' apostolic succession ' and fails to live in obedience—or even to try to live in obedience—to the Word of God in Scripture. Scripture *is* apostolicity.

Thirdly, in addition to Scripture, the apostles have bequeathed something, not to the ministry, but to the whole Church. They have left us their mission. Like them, we are bidden to go into all the world and make disciples of every nation.

Let us be faithful in these things, and we shall do more to advance the unity and purity of Christ's Church than if, for the sake of a superficial harmony, we come to terms with a doctrine which neither mind nor conscience can accept.

Literature

THE ASCENSION

Dr. J. G. Davies' Bampton Lectures—*He Ascended into Heaven : A Study in the History of Doctrine* (Lutterworth Press ; 35s. net)—are intended to fill a gap in doctrinal history. The gap was certainly there, and we can be grateful to him for his contribution towards the filling of it.

After dealing with the Biblical foundations (including Old Testament ' prefigurement '), he follows the treatment of the Ascension in its varying degrees of attention or negligence by the teachers and preachers of the Church down to the beginning of the Middle Ages ; and in the final lecture he attempts to draw together from the preceding history certain applications of the credal statement which may be thought to need re-emphasizing in Christian doctrine. One cannot help thinking that it would have been better either to have stopped at the fifth century or to have skipped from there to the thirteenth or the sixteenth ; for despite Dr. Davies' opinion to the contrary, it is difficult to imagine that either the Middle Ages or the Reformation were as barren of interest for the subject as the six centuries down to 1200 to which his last historical lecture is devoted.

In his discussion of the New Testament evidence, Dr Davies insists that ' ascension ' is necessarily pre-supposed in every reference to the ' exaltation ' of Christ, the assertion of which, backed by the *testimonium* from Ps 110, is clearly integral to the Apostolic *kerygma* ; and that this belief that Jesus as the Christ is now in heaven, ' seated at God's right hand ', is essentially distinct from the belief that He has risen from the dead. Acts 1, however, is the only place where the *event* of Ascension is described and dated by an interval of forty days after the Resurrection. Both Lk 24 and Jn 20 are naturally understood as placing the Ascension on Easter Day itself ; and this dating is in harmony with Mt 28^{18} and with what appears to be implied in Ac $2^{32f.}$ as well as in the tradition set forth by St. Paul in 1 Co 15. Dr. Davies concludes that the familiar story of the Ascension in Ac 1 is unreliable. He is aware that this conclusion removes the only testimony of *witnesses* to the Ascension, but he does not deal with the resulting difficulty : if the story of a *witnessed* ' going-up ' after the appearances of the forty days is legend, how did the Apostolic Church come to distinguish between Resurrection and Ascension—as Dr. Davies is sure that it did ? What was the ground of belief in the exaltation of the Christ ?

Dr. Davies goes so far as to say that the acceptance of Ac 1 as exclusively authoritative has ' bedevilled ' the subsequent treatment of the doctrine, preventing the Ascension from being seen as ' closely associated with the Resurrection as one

element in a single process '—' part of the redemptive act'. Yet this judgment is hardly borne out by Lectures 4 to 6 in which the teaching of the patristic period is reviewed. In fact the *redemptive* significance of the Ascension is what governs many of the references to it quoted from Irenaeus, Athanasius, Ambrose, Chrysostom, and Augustine —to mention only the most prominent names. They all take their text from Eph 2^6—'hath seated us together with him in the heavenlies'. The Ascension *means* the exaltation of 'human nature' from earth to heaven; for Christ is the firstfruits in whose offering to God the whole of the following harvest is included. Dr. Davies rightly emphasises this interpretation of the Ascension in his final lecture. He himself appears to accept the orthodox doctrine of *enhypostasia*: the Ascension, he says, was 'not the occasion of the exaltation of an individual man, but of human nature'. He does not discuss the extent to which this doctrine was bound up with the Platonist-realist conceptions of the Fathers—conceptions most clearly apparent in such texts as those quoted from Hilary ('through the nature of the body which he had taken on himself an assembling together of the whole human race is contained') or Chrysostom ('the universal nature was brought into heaven through the firstfruits'). In Augustine's characteristic doctrine of the *totus Christus*, there is indeed more than a partial return from Platonist to Pauline ideas. But it must be admitted that Eph 2^6 is the *only* place in the New Testament where the 'redemptive significance' of the Ascension is indicated—unless we find it in the teaching of the Epistle to the Hebrews. In general, the New Testament regards the Ascension as a *Christological* event: it is *Christ's* humanity—'this same Jesus'—not humanity in general, that has been exalted to the right hand of God. However it may have been that the Apostolic Church came to believe in that exaltation, we may agree with Dr. Davies that the belief involves more than that 'Jesus lives': it means that Jesus *reigns*; and the Lordship of Jesus, at least for the writers of the New Testament, is what His servants do not and cannot share. That is the Name at which *every* knee must bow.

J. Burnaby

THE PAULINE EPISTLES

Many books have been written and continue to be written about Paul and his letters. The latest one is entitled *The Pauline Epistles: Their Meaning and Message* and is by the Rev. James T. Hudson, B.A., B.D. (James Clarke; 21s. net). It is, however, worked out according to a somewhat novel plan. Professor G. H. C. Macgregor, who writes a Foreword, describes it as 'distinctly original in both format and content'.

The book opens with a chapter on the sequence of the Epistles. This is followed by a chapter on each of them individually, and a further chapter on 'The Theology of St. Paul'. Then come the Epistles themselves. These are presented in a new translation. This is, however, supplemented by words in square brackets, which help to bring out the meaning or clarify the sequence of thought. In a broad margin on the left of the translation a summary of each paragraph is given, and footnotes are added where any special point requires elucidation.

Where a matter is still in dispute, Mr. Hudson usually decides firmly in favour of the solution he prefers. He confidently ascribes Philippians and Colossians to Paul's Ephesian ministry, and gives strong arguments in favour of this earlier date. He treats 2 Thessalonians as written earlier than 1 Thessalonians, and rejects the Pauline authorship of the Pastorals, in spite of recent attempts to re-establish it. Ephesians he regards as a summary of Pauline thought, built up mainly from materials found in the other Epistles, and originally intended as an introduction to them, when they were first published together as the Pauline Corpus.

The chapter on theology is necessarily somewhat brief, but hardly does justice to the importance for Pauline thought of such great themes as Grace, Faith, Justification, and the Holy Spirit.

In his translation of the Epistles the author does not lack courage to take an unusual line or venture a daring phrase. He follows Moffatt in putting (without any manuscript evidence for it) Ro 7^{25b} in front of 7^{24}. He also refuses to translate the Aramaic words 'Maranatha' in 1 Co 16^{22} as 'Our Lord, come', but links them closely with the violent words of denunciation which precede them, and translates: 'Thou art excommunicated'. In Ro 8^3 the familiar words: 'He condemned sin in the flesh' become 'In our earthly nature he nonsuited sin'. The whole of 1 Co 13 is treated as 'an ode consisting of four triads'. Verse 7 he interprets as: 'Love bears every burden, believes every excuse, hopes for every improvement, endures every hardship'.

The book is an unusual and fresh approach to a familiar subject. It is a pity that it is somewhat blemished by a number of misprints.

C. L. Mitton

THE GNOSTIC PROBLEM

A very notable volume has come to hand from the Rev. R. McLaren Wilson, B.D., Ph.D.,

Lecturer in New Testament Language and Literature in St. Mary's College, St. Andrews University —*The Gnostic Problem* (Mowbray; 35s. net). The title is defined in the sub-title 'A Study of the Relations between Hellenistic Judaism and the Gnostic Heresy'.

New studies of Gnosticism have been numerous in recent years, and Dr. McLaren Wilson has had the mortifying experience of seeing not a few important books or papers on Gnosticism appearing after his own work was in the Press. None the less what he has given us is a very valuable contribution.

He begins with an interesting account of the Jewish Diaspora, which began much earlier than is commonly realized. Certainly it increased greatly in the days of Alexander the Great, but Jews were widely diffused in many regions long before that. The Jews of the Diaspora were exposed to the influence of their new environment. Some were known to be apostates from their faith. Others may well have adopted some features from Gentile religions. It may be taken as likely, however, that in general those borrowings were trifles which did not affect any fundamentals of their faith. Their neighbours were as likely to borrow from them. Yet those districts towards the East were in considerable danger. As time passed there was a great tendency in the pagan world towards syncretism.

Next we get an account of Alexandrian Judaism and Philo, then of Gnosticism and New Testament Christianity, then of the earlier Gnostic sects, Gnosticism and the Christian philosophers.

Then comes a most important chapter which makes a fresh contribution to our knowledge of Gnosticism. For the first time in English the author is able to give an account of two Gnostic documents recently brought to light—the *Apocryphon Johannis* and the *Gospel of Truth*. The interest of the documents is great. Hitherto our knowledge of the tenets of Gnosticism at its best period was limited to Hippolytus' and Irenaeus' refutation of them. Now we have two original Gnostic writings, and Dr. Wilson gives a full account of the contents. The *Gospel of Truth* is almost orthodox and if—as some believe—Valentinus himself is the author, one can only think that he wrote it before his break with the Church.

In closing Dr. Wilson examines the possibility, even the probability, that Judaism gave something to Gnosticism, and drew something from it. The possibility is certain, the probability is high. But what Judaism absorbed was no more than as in Philo, a coming to terms with Greek philosophy. What Gnosticism absorbed was something founded on the Jewish Creation story, a knowledge of Hebrew names, which they often misunderstood, perhaps from Jewish magic some of their words-of-power, pass-words, and other superstitious elements. On the other hand, as is more fully shown in Christian Gnostic heresy, in what they borrowed there was a deep-seated misunderstanding. 'When all is said, despite its Jewish and Christian elements, despite its contribution to Christian thought as an experiment in accommodating . . . Gnosticism is not Christian but a phase of heathenism' (p. 265).

Full and often most illuminating Notes are added to each chapter and there is a full index.

W. D. NIVEN

MUTUALITY

The author of *Concerning Human Understanding* (Allen and Unwin; 30s. net), Nikrenja Vihari Banerjee—a Professor in the University of Delhi —explicitly states in his Preface to his book that the idea of 'system' is foreign to it, and he judges his book rightly; but the consequences of his attitude are rather unfortunate and lead to a certain amount of incoherence and unnecessary repetition. The point of view is that of an out-and-out realist, dominated by devotion to 'common sense'. Take the world, he urges, as the ordinary man finds it, have done with the exclusive claims of science which result in materialism, and the sophistications of philosophies which constantly evade the actual problems of life, and the demands of 'the religion of God or gods' which lead to institutionalism and servile submission to authority. Above all, avoid Idealism, especially Absolute Idealism, which destroys the freedom and personality of man. Neither do the negative philosophical attitudes of his own cultural inheritance satisfy the author, as he thinks that asceticism and reliance upon belief in Transmigration and Immortality are simply ways of escape from actual living.

His solution is that the enlargement of the scope which science has unduly narrowed and negation has neglected is the discovery of *mutuality* between man and man, the realization that men are essential to one another. What matters is not our relation to God or to the outer world only, but to our fellow-men; and we reach the practical application of this through the cultivation of a sense of values in the world and a strengthening of our feeling of obligation. The source of all evil is in our ignorance of this mutuality, and salvation is to be found in following the example of such leaders of men as Buddha, who renounced the opportunity of immediate personal salvation in order to devote himself to the enlightenment of humanity; and especially of Jesus Christ, not in the dogmas which obscured or the institutions which belied His

teaching, but in His loving-kindness, His bearing of the 'cross of disvalue', even until death that He might deliver men from selfish individualism. So it would appear that 'mutuality', the author's foundation principle, is not so far separated from religion as he seems to think.

W. S. URQUHART

FRANCIS ASBURY

Methodism was introduced into America in 1766, nearly thirty years after its beginning in England; yet by the earlier part of the nineteenth century there were more Methodists in the United States than in this country, and that at a time when the population there was still less than here. In this remarkable achievement the acknowledged leader was Francis Asbury, a man who ranks in the annals of Methodism second only to Wesley. His labours rivalled even those of his great leader: Wesley is reckoned to have travelled a quarter of a million miles and preached forty thousand sermons, Asbury also travelled a quarter of a million miles and preached over sixteen thousand sermons, both were great not only as preachers but as organizers; though Asbury was no writer like Wesley, yet he had perhaps a greater part in spreading education; and he was also in at the making of a great nation and is numbered among its founding fathers.

It is good therefore that the World Methodist Council, not apparently without some prompting from the United States Historical Publications Commission, has at last remedied the neglect of over a hundred years by sponsoring the re-publication of Asbury's Journal together with his letters, which are now collected for the first time—*The Journal and Letters of Francis Asbury*, 3 vols., editor-in-chief Elmer T. Clark (Epworth Press and Abingdon Press; 150s. the set).

The Journal invites comparison with that of Wesley. There is the same terse simple prose, though Asbury has none of Wesley's flashes of humour, nor his vivid touch with an anecdote, nor quite the same eye for people and places. The character revealed is one of inflexible single-mindedness; nothing could seriously engage his attention but evangelism and the building up of the Church. Even the War of Independence is heard only as noises off, though that event was the crisis of his own work, for, by throwing in his lot with the Americans when all the other English preachers left for home, he shaped the course of history.

It is significant that, as soon as he arrived in America, he set his face against the tendency of the preachers to settle down in one place, and insisted on itinerancy. This was a momentous decision, since it was the Methodist Circuit rider who kept the gospel always on the advancing frontier and saved America from paganism. Itinerancy, vital preaching, strict Methodist discipline—these were the pillars of his policy, and on them he reared a solid and enduring structure. But it was his own character and example, his dogged integrity and will-power, and a lifetime of endless journeyings in the hard pioneering days, often in ill-health—it was these that made his career an epic of service to Methodism and to America, and of these the Journal speaks on almost every page.

He was a great man; and this edition is an act of necessary piety, a fine and fitting memorial, for which we are grateful. The notes are brief, factual, and unobtrusive. But both notes and index would seem to require some checking and revising. There are omissions in the index; there is also the repetition of almost identical notes, in one case four times, though elsewhere cross-references are given. These are small points, but in a standard edition, and one as expensive as this, we should have expected the index to be scrupulously accurate and the notes co-ordinated with the utmost care and economy.

G. E. LONG

CHRISTIAN WORSHIP

Writing as an Anglican who has been deeply influenced by a wide ecumenical experience, the Rev. William Nicholls holds that a full and true Christian worship necessarily possesses three main elements—'the downward movement of the Word, the upward movement of man's response, the presence of the Holy Spirit giving life to both'. This explains his choice of title, *Jacob's Ladder* (Lutterworth Press; 7s. 6d. net), for he presents Christian worship in terms of traffic between heaven and earth by means of the once-for-all Jacob's Ladder, even Jesus Christ Himself. Along with the Genesis reference to Jacob's Ladder, there are also quoted in front of this study the words of our Lord Himself, taken from the Fourth Gospel about 'the angels of God ascending and descending upon the Son of Man'. Such a quotation leads naturally into a book marked throughout by the post-Lund Christological emphasis in the theology of the Church, and we find here both a theological and Biblical interpretation of worship, indeed a product of the present-day Biblical theology.

There are points at which one is inclined to question whether the Christological exegesis is not being driven too hard, as, for example, in the detailed note on priestly and prophetic conceptions of worship (pp. 31–35). That 'whatever authority

the Old Testament has for Christians it has as a whole, in so far as it points to Christ', may be true, but the argument in this section seems mainly to be building up a case for asserting that 'it is possible to return to the priestly elements in the Old Testament and view them with more sympathy than they sometimes receive from Protestant theologians'.

The danger running through much of the writer's excellent theological treatment of Christian worship is that of too readily assuming that the present forms of worship, for him the Anglican, do in fact embody the theological truths for which he is rightly concerned. This recalls the orthodox error of holding the traditional church infallible. It is all too easy complacently to forget that judgment begins at the House of God.

At the same time, better than most other Anglican theological writers, Mr. Nicholls grasps the place of the Word in the Church. His impressive chapter on 'The Proclamation of the Word of God' is a useful call to the Reformed Churches to return to their real principles of worship. He writes that 'the Word is constitutive of the Church, for it is Jesus Christ, God incarnate, who is the living and true Word of God, and the Church depends wholly upon His work of revelation and redemption. The liturgy, therefore, must serve in the first place the proclamation of the Word of God, so that Christ may continually renew and build up the Church upon its one foundation.'

This is a very discerning study of Christian worship which poses many burning questions to Mr. Nicholls' fellow-Anglicans and to theologians, liturgists and ministers of other traditions. We cannot be too grateful for his emphasis that Christian worship is the activity of the redeemed people of God, and that in worship the Holy Spirit plays a vital part.

Both by its compass and by its approach, this book could be usefully taken as a basis for discussion in a congregational Bible Study Group.

R. Stuart Louden

The first third of Professor E. B. Castle's book—*Moral Education in Christian Times* (Allen and Unwin; 30s. net)—deals in summary fashion with the beginnings of Christian education in the Roman Empire, with the mediaeval period, the Renaissance, the Protestant reformers and the Jesuits, and with new developments during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. The rest of the book is concerned with educational theory and practice from the beginning of the eighteenth century to the present day. Most of the later material is drawn from English sources but due attention is paid to the educational pioneers of France, Germany and other European countries and seventeen pages are devoted to developments in the United States of America. It will be clear from this brief account of the book's subject-matter that Professor Castle has attempted an ambitious survey of the whole field of European education in the Christian centuries. His method of procedure is essentially descriptive and copious quotations from a wide range of educational writers are used in building up a picture of moral education under Christian influences. The resultant picture is full of ambiguity and contradiction but Professor Castle does not attempt to criticize or evaluate the divergent and contradictory trends in educational theory and practice which claim Christian authority. We are left in the end with no clear impression of the lessons to be learned from twenty centuries of Christian education and we are not helped to think more deeply about the educational implications of Christian belief. 'Obedience is a means to discipline; discipline is a condition of freedom; responsibility and discipline feed each other. These seem to be the general principles on which parents and teachers in all their variety should seek to work.' It seems a somewhat trite conclusion from so ambitious a survey. Yet this book affords many interesting and entertaining glimpses of educational theory and practice in Western Christendom and many readers will be grateful to Professor Castle for sharing with them the fruits of his wide reading. There is a full bibliography of relevant literature.

Sixteen writers, all experts in their own field, have contributed to this interesting symposium on Freud's impact on twentieth-century thought—*Freud and the Twentieth Century*, edited by Benjamin Nelson (Allen and Unwin; 28s. net). As the editor writes in the Preface, they 'hail from many lands, espouse diverse—even contradictory—views, and are by no means committed to the promotion of psychoanalysis'.

There are some interesting reminiscences of Freud, some spirited defence of his concepts and influence; a very excellent lecture by E. H. Gombrich on 'Psychoanalysis and the History of Art'. Naturally in a centenarian volume one would expect a good deal of appreciation of the man and his genius; but the critical note is fairly strong. Nigel Walker, who recently gave us a 'History of Psychotherapy', deals with the question as to whether Freud was really 'A New Copernicus'. There is a provocative essay on 'Freud, Marx and Kierkegaard', an informative one on the impact of Freud on American psychology, and one that really deals with the revisionists, Karen Horney, Fromm and Sullivan, in a penetrating fashion. Maritain's approach to Freud from

a Thomist point of view is another penetrating essay. But there is not a dull essay in the whole book.

The Joseph Smith Memorial Lecture for 1958 was given by Professor John Foster, who chose for his subject *The Preacher's Use of Church History*. The lecture is published by the Berean Press at 2s. net. Dr. Foster deals in brief but fruity compass with three things—Preaching about the Church, Saints in the Church Year, and Illustrations from Church History.

As to the first, he begins with the affirmation 'the Church is part of the Gospel'. 'The whole subject of the Bible is God and His people'. We should have realized that better if the two parts of the Bible had been called the Old and the New Covenants. 'If we do not present God and His people we are not preaching the Gospel'. Many people think that from the Apostolic Age to the Reformation nothing much matters; our own denomination is all I need care about. We should claim a larger ancestry. All down the centuries were saints, martyrs and 'plain souls who lived by Christian Faith and died in it'. We should claim to belong to the whole Church, not a denomination only. In 'traditions' outside our own are many noble things and we have a claim on them. The Holy Catholic Church is the Communion of Saints, whatever denominational label may be attached to them. In heaven the labels will be unknown. All that is finely and forcibly said.

In the second part Dr. Foster shows how worth telling are the stories of the great Saints, chiefly of the early Christian centuries. He does not quite mean that we should construct a Calendar of the Saints and keep strictly to 'Saints' Days', but that we should find much excellent material in the lives and teaching of men like Ignatius, Irenaeus, Clement of Alexandria, Francis Xavier and others.

Finally, preachers will find in Church History a fruitful source of illustrations: he takes as an example 'the fruits of the spirit' (Gal $5^{22f.}$). In illustration of each of the 'fruits' he gives an extract from an early Christian writing. All those citations are telling and impressive.

At 5.30 p.m. on 28th December 1946, Sir William Hamilton Fyfe, Vice-Chancellor of the University of Aberdeen and leader of a delegation sent by the Inter-University Council for Higher Education in the Colonies, pushed his way through the 'bush' a few miles north of the town of Ibadan in Nigeria until he reached a clearing where it was possible to see a few yards ahead. He planted his walking-stick firmly into the ground and said: 'Here shall be the University of Nigeria'. *The Birth of Nigeria's University*, by Principal Kenneth Mellanby, C.B.E., Sc.D. (Methuen; 25s. net), tells the story of the early years of that institution. When Dr. Mellanby went out to Nigeria in 1947 he *was* the University. There was no governing body, no staff, no students. To-day, the University College, Ibadan has magnificent buildings set in a five square mile 'campus', strong faculties in Arts, Science and Medicine, and a high academic status.

It was not achieved without turmoil. There were endless difficulties with planning experts in far-off London, with architects, and with staff, white and black. Dr. Mellanby was criticized by some Europeans for being too pro-African, and by the nationalist press of Nigeria for being 'anti-Negro'. He has pungent things to say about colleagues who stood on sometimes doubtful dignity. Perhaps, in contrast, he sees the students in too golden a light. But there is credit in this achievement, and the years to come will prove its worth. Strange, however, to read of a University in which religion plays so small a part, and that in a land where religion is deep-rooted in native culture. Surely it is not enough to dismiss religious belief as 'a phenomenon which deserves the attention of sociologists and other research workers as well as of ministers and clergy'.

A book which, like Loraine Boettner's *Immortality* (Pickering and Inglis; 15s. net), deals with this subject and quotes largely from Scripture, must contain many true and solemn things. This book, however, contains too much else; for example, 'the fact that Adam did not die for some 930 years after the Fall', and a brisk proof that cremation is anti-Christian.

The Publications Board of the Presbyterian Church in Ireland has marked the centenary of the religious awakening of Ulster in 1859 by publishing *God's River in Spate*, an account of the awakening by the Rev. John T. Carson. After a century the time is ripe for a re-telling of the story and for an assessment of the movement in its outstanding features, its results and its lessons for to-day. Mr. Carson writes sympathetically but not uncritically, relying on the secular rather than the religious press for his facts. The result is an important contribution to the appreciation of a movement which soon spread to Scotland, England and Wales, and which, partly because no great evangelist's name can be associated with it, has seldom received the credit that it deserves. Mr. Carson's book, admirably produced at 9s. 6d. net, will help to put the matter in better focus. We wish it many readers.

Milestones in Books. VII.

By Professor H. H. Rowley, D.D., B.Litt., F.B.A., The University of Manchester [1]

The most formative influences in my life have been persons rather than books. For eighteen years, starting from the earliest time I can remember, I had as my minister W. Y. Fullerton, whose deep evangelical and missionary interest soon kindled my heart, and on every memory of whom I thank God. In my College days in Bristol I learned much from the rugged honesty of W. J. Henderson, and sat at the feet of R. S. Franks, for whose massive scholarship I have an undying regard, and who immensely stimulated my mind. Later I went to Oxford, where again two very different men greatly influenced me. W. B. Selbie, most approachable of great men, profoundly impressed me by his vital personality, and G. B. Gray by his overwhelming learning. To meet Gray was always depressing and exhilarating—depressing in that I always felt that such profound scholarship was for ever beyond my reach, and exhilarating in that it made me eagerly desire what it set so far beyond me.

Nevertheless, books have played a large part in my life. When I was a small schoolboy—and I was always the smallest boy in my class—I read *Pastor Hsi*, and it moved me as no book till then had done and created in me a powerful desire to learn Chinese, and a more powerful desire to go to China as a missionary. About the same time I had a copy of Farrar's *Life of Christ* as a Scripture prize, and this not alone fascinated me, but annoyed me by the Hebrew and Greek in its footnotes and made me determined to acquire some knowledge of those languages. Some years later, when I applied to the Bristol Baptist College for training for the mission field, I was set Hebrew for my entrance examination. I could find no one who could help me with this study and so had to learn it without a teacher—in the days before there was a Key to Davidson! I found it hard, and therefore enjoyable, and acquired such a love for Hebrew that from the day I entered College the future course of my life was largely determined.

In fields other than Hebrew and Old Testament and cognate studies many of the books I read in College greatly opened my mind. I think of James Seth's *Ethical Principles*, John Caird's *Introduction to the Philosophy of Religion*, R. L. Ottley's

[1] Harold Henry Rowley was born on 24th March, 1890. He was educated at Wyggeston School, Leicester, the Bristol Baptist College and Bristol University, and Mansfield College, Oxford. After serving as Minister of the United Church, Wells, Somerset, from 1917–22, he spent eight years as a missionary in China, and held an Associate Professorship of Old Testament Literature in Shantung Christian University. He returned to this country and was appointed in 1930 Assistant Lecturer in Semitic Languages in the University College of South Wales, Cardiff, and in 1935 he became Professor of Semitic Languages in the University College of North Wales, Bangor, where, from 1940–45, he was also Lecturer in the History of Religions and Vice-Principal of the College. He left Bangor to take up the Chair of Semitic Languages and Literatures in the University of Manchester from which he retires this year. Many distinctions have been conferred upon him—honorary doctorates from Universities at home and abroad, membership of foreign learned societies, election as a Fellow of the British Academy, and the award in 1951 of the Academy's Burkitt Medal for Biblical Studies. In 1955 the Society for Old Testament Study joined with the Editorial Board of *Vetus Testamentum* in honouring him by the presentation of a volume of essays in celebration of his sixty-fifth birthday.

The great distinction which Professor Rowley enjoys in the world of Old Testament scholarship and his widely recognized leadership in these studies is the fitting reward of a lifetime of unsparing labour. He is a most prolific writer and skilful editor. Language, literature, history, archaeology, religion, theology—all these subjects of Old Testament research have seized his interest at different times and called forth from him valuable and richly documented contributions in innumerable books and articles. His scholarly work is of the highest order. He has given generously also to students. Very many have been helped by his judicious guidance and by his masterly critical digests. His services to the Society for Old Testament Study have been outstanding over a long period. Since 1946 he has been its foreign secretary, and he has used the opportunity of office for the promotion of Old Testament scholarship in the international sphere and for the fostering of friendship among scholars of all nations. Under his editorship the Society's annual *Book List* has become known and valued the world over. The initiative he showed in the attempt to salvage European scholarship after the War was as imaginative as it was humane. To many an Old Testament scholar in difficulty he brought hope and encouragement and books. The debt which his pupils and colleagues owe to him is indeed beyond measure.

D. Winton Thomas

Doctrine of the Incarnation, F. H. Bradley's *Appearance and Reality* and the more easily digested A. E. Taylor's *Elements of Metaphysics*, and last but not least, R. S. Franks' *History of the Doctrine of the Work of Christ*. This last work, which ought never to have been allowed to go so rapidly out of print, was not published until after I had left College, but much of it I had heard in the form of College lectures, to my lasting enrichment.

In this article, however, I want to limit myself to six books in my own *Fach* which have influenced me more than all others. To single out six books is no easy matter. Many others look down upon me from my shelves and reproach me for leaving them unmentioned, and I shrink from their reproach.

(1) The first is a book now nearly two hundred and fifty years old, though I do not have the original edition. This is Humphrey Prideaux' *The Old and New Testament Connected*. When I was a schoolboy I persuaded my brother to buy this from a second-hand bookstall by assuring him that it would be valuable to him as a lay preacher. His estimate of it was not mine, and he soon gave me the two volumes. I wish I had persuaded him to buy more. I spent a holiday devouring these volumes, and they gave me an interest in the post-exilic period which is still with me. They are, of course, quite out-of-date. I did not know that, and when shortly afterwards W. Y. Fullerton observed from the pulpit that the Ahasuerus of the Book of Esther was Xerxes, a schoolboy in his congregation sat up and afterwards went to him armed with Prideaux to ask where that old scholar had been wrong in arguing at great length that it was Artaxerxes Longimanus! I have, of course, since learned that Prideaux must be corrected on a hundred points; but I have still a deep respect for the way that old scholar used his classical sources, which were all that he had available to supplement the Bible, and I still consult Prideaux with profit. Out-of-date works often have a high value for those who know how to use them. But this work was a milestone for me in that it aroused my interest in a new and fascinating world.

(2) In my College days I read W. Robertson Smith's *Prophets of Israel*. This gave to me, as it has given to many another, a new understanding of the prophets. Of course scholarship has not stood still since the days of Robertson Smith, and I should to-day question many things in that book. Yet from it my study of the prophets took its rise, and it was a milestone in my life because it set me on a new way, and not because I sat beside the milestone to dream that my journey was over. From the moment when I read it the prophets became to me a field of never-ending study, in which I have found unfailing joy and rich reward.

(3) The next milestone was Edwyn Bevan's *House of Seleucus*. What a delight it was to read these two volumes! They took me back to part of the ground covered by Prideaux, but this was a twentieth-century work—albeit some years old before it came into my hands—and less likely to mislead me as Prideaux had done on Artaxerxes Longimanus. Moreover it was written with that charm of style which characterized Bevan's pen. My interest in the Hellenistic period of Jewish history was stirred in a new way, and this has been one of the enduring interests which has dominated not a little of my own work. Of course I have read a great many other works on this period, and have learned from all of them. But the joy with which I read Bevan is still with me, and *The House of Seleucus*—now unhappily out of print—is still one of the most treasured works of my library.

(4) We now come to John Skinner's *Prophecy and Religion*, that great exposition of the prophet Jeremiah. I was in China when this book was published, and a friend almost immediately sent it to me for a birthday gift. It brought me a deeper insight into the personality of the most human and most lovable of the prophets. I had read other good books on Jeremiah, including A. S. Peake's excellent commentary in the Century Bible. But Skinner was more than a commentary, and it brought me into closer touch with the mind and spirit of Jeremiah than anything I had read. Again I should not agree with everything in Skinner to-day. But the test of a book is not whether it commands immediate and unquestioning agreement, but its power to quicken the mind of the reader. A few years after I had read this book I had to take a course on Jeremiah in the Chinese University where I was working. The students came to the course unwillingly, with little interest in the Old Testament and some feeling that its study was a waste of time. What they were given owed not a little to Skinner, with the result that they soon developed an enthusiasm that surprised no less than it delighted me—though I have no doubt that Skinner lost much when he was translated into my clumsy Chinese—and again and again the students discovered for themselves that Jeremiah had an unsuspected relevance to their own situation in modern China.

(5) My next milestone was Paul (now Édouard) Dhorme's commentary on the Book of Job in the *Études Bibliques*. This was not my first introduction to the Book of Job, of course. I had long before read it in Hebrew with various commentaries, including Peake's excellent work in the

Century Bible. But I found in Dhorme a maturity of judgment on all the problems, textual and exegetical, surrounding that difficult book, and his commentary stood out as a model commentary, penetrating in its insight into the meaning of the book as well as marked by exact scholarship on every point it dealt with. In some commentaries it is easy to lose the wood for the trees. Here I never lost a sense of the greatness of the book in all the detailed work the commentary necessarily contained, and I gained a love for the Book of Job, surpassing any I had before known, which has brought me back again and again to it.

(6) The last of my six milestones was George Foot Moore's *Judaism*. When it was published it was hailed as one of the great works of this century, and that judgment still stands. Few scholars have more penetrated the spirit of Judaism than Moore, whose learning was matched with his power to express it. Many other scholars have contributed in no mean way to show how much in Judaism was fine and attractive, and to make it clear that the Pharisaism that is so often condemned in the New Testament was not the only Pharisaism. None has rendered a greater service to the student and scholar than Moore in this work, and from the time when I first read it in China I have been deeply interested in the Judaism that developed out of the Old Testament religion, as well as in the Christianity which has its roots in the Old Testament and for which the Old Testament is still sacred Scripture, yet which is so much else than a simple development from Old Testament religion, and which soon came to stand over against Judaism.

A great book is valuable, not merely as the deposit of the learning and thought of its author, but as the stimulus to other minds. It awakens an interest which it does not wholly satisfy, and sets the reader on a quest. It may seem at first to be definitive, and to leave no room for further study. Yet to no man is perfect and complete knowledge given, and the most that any can hope to do is to make some contribution here and there to the totality of knowledge. Each of these great books owes much to writers who had gone before, and while each brings something new, its greatness lies in its power to encourage others to come into its field and to explore its treasures. These six books will indicate some of the fields into which I have been beckoned, and will explain some of the interests that have marked my own studies. Many could be added to the six, some small but immensely stimulating books such as C. F. Burney's Schweich Lectures, S. A. Cook's *Notes on Old Testament History*, or Wheeler Robinson's *Religious Ideas of the Old Testament*, all of which started me on tracks which I have explored with delight. But these six stand out in my memory as the books which most influenced me, and which most determined the way of my own work. They all link on to some aspect of the study of the Old Testament, or of that intertestamental period which leads on to the New Testament. They have all held before me in their differing ways the ideals of exact and objective scholarship; yet none has made me lose that regard for the Bible as the lively oracles of God which I first learned at the feet of W. Y. Fullerton. For infusing all technical study of the innumerable problems surrounding the Old Testament there may be a concern to understand what God was saying to men, and still says to men, through this most wonderful of books.

The Structure of Theological Education[1]

By Professor John McIntyre, B.D., D.Litt., The University of Edinburgh

The main contention which I wish to advance is that the time has now arrived for us to examine from the beginning the whole *structure* of theological education. In other words, if in the past it has been adequate to add a little here, to remove a little there, and to mask this or that with a veneer of pretence, the time is past for *ad hoc* and *ad lib.* remedies. The situation requires, in other words, basic discussion which may lead in the end to a total reconstruction. I say so because I am now convinced, after discussions with students in vastly differing traditions and environments, that their complaints are not all noise signifying nothing; and *that* because of the very difference of their traditions and environments. In fact, their dissatisfaction with theological education has been produced by fundamental tensions that have now crept into that system. In their self diagnosis they usually locate their trouble in the necessity to study Hebrew or in the absence of courses in psychiatry, but they do so because these are the only identifiable targets. Their dissatisfaction, on the contrary, is not to be dealt with so simply; for it is deeper-seated.

[1] This paper was read at a conference of the members of staff of the four theological colleges of the Scottish Universities, at St. Mary's College, University of St. Andrews, May 16, 1958.

What are these tensions ? They are fourfold.

1. There is the tension between what for simplicity's sake I shall call the *American* and the *British* types of education, and of theological education. The American type is designed primarily to produce in the student certain specific skills and techniques. The courses offered have in themselves no structure whatever ; they are a list of classes. The student imposes order upon the chaos and he does so in terms of the kind of skills which he is likely to require in the type of ministry which he intends to perform. A school chaplaincy aspirant could quite possibly never meet a student preparing for overseas missionary work in the three years in seminary, because the ultimate skills required differ so much from each other and the preparatory courses will be correspondingly mutually exclusive. The strength of this system is that it prepares a man very well for a particular ministry, and in its strength lies its weakness : for the man may find himself ill-equipped for any other ministry.

Under the British system, if I understand it aright, the intention is to give the student not skills or techniques necessary in a given type of ministry, but disciplines and discipline necessary in every ministry. The disciplines are those of the four or five basic academic subjects ; and the discipline is that of a well-trained mind, which can discern the problem and make reasonable efforts to solve it. It rather chooses to leave the handling of the practical situation, in the school chaplaincy or in the mission field, to *chance*, though sometimes a rather novel and heretical form of the Doctrine of the Holy Spirit is introduced at this point to atone for the imperfections of the system. It assumes, if it is less doctrinal in form, that once you have given the man a foundation, then discipline plus gumption will see him through any situation.

Incidentally this principle held in other spheres. Pre-War and post-War, certain of the larger industrial houses have invited to join their executive staffs Honours graduates in Arts with literally no knowledge of the techniques of the industry, solely on the assumption that a trained mind will make its contribution whatever the sphere in which it operates.

Now, as long as these two systems are kept separate, no sleep is lost. The trouble begins when they meet ; and when those who were trained under one system begin to sense the advantage of the other. We have experienced this influence from the British side, and have attempted to meet what we felt was a deficiency in the British theological system by adding indefinite numbers of new fragmentary subjects under Pastoral Theology. Periodically we rebel and deport these undesirable immigrants, reverting to the simpler system. The folly of adding indefinitely many techniques and skills under Practical Theology is that we are attempting to bring together two quite different conceptions of theological education. Those odds and ends of fragments can be added to the American type of system indefinitely, because that is the way the system works. It is indefinitely expandable. The British system is not : for good or ill, it has no elasticity.

It is an interesting fact that in some of the Eastern American Seminaries this process is happening in reverse. In the midst of the skills and techniques type of aggregate curriculum there is emerging a pure British type of course for the man who wishes the disciplines and the discipline. Consciously or not, the directors of Seminary programmes have endeavoured to introduce some greater order into the aggregates, and to provide something that looks very like a Scottish B.D. I should say that a considerable part of our difficulty in obtaining suitable candidates for Ph.D. is due to the radical difference of systems above mentioned. It is not just that some of the subjects for which we look in a B.D. degree are missing ; but also that those that are there and are recognized as friends seem to have been keeping very strange company and are all out of order.

Reverting to the dissatisfaction of the students with the curriculum, I would not say that they are dissatisfied because they want to be educated like Americans. But they do clamour for a practical type of training ; and certain people in high places say the same thing. But high or low, what they ask is an education which embodies provision of skills and techniques.

This is what I call the first tension : between training of our kind, the British, and a hankering after training of another kind, the American. In reaction to this situation it is imperative that we do our thinking in series.

(1) Is the distinction between the two types of theological education correctly defined as one between skills or techniques and disciplines with discipline ?

(2) Are we completely convinced that the so-called British system is still the last word in theological education ? If our answer here is ' yes ', then I must apologize for any further waste of time. If our answer is ' no ', then we must look at the next question.

(3) Assuming that we do not wish to go over to the American type of theological education, how can we re-draft the British system to do these things the American system does so much more fully and yet retain the virtues of the British type ?

Let me suggest three brief answers to this

question. (*a*) We may first revise our estimate of the relation of Practical Theology to the other subjects, and state quite firmly that it is an academic discipline as they are, and reject the idea that it is non-academic, non-theoretical and so on. This revision will involve necessarily a thorough re-examination of the smaller subjects included within Practical Theology. (*b*) Secondly, we may recognize explicitly what has recently been generally implicitly accepted, that the normal academic subjects carry definite practical implications. They are not pursued in ivory-tower isolation, but constantly in relation to the Church and the world. In other words, what under the old interpretation was expected to happen in the fifth, 'the practical subject', must now happen within the academic subjects. The 'relevance' of the theological education to the actual ministry is established at all points on the front, and not only at one. (*c*) The third possibility is to look at the whole structure of the contemporary system, and ask precisely, in terms of the British type of education with its emphasis on disciplines and discipline, where the disciplines and the discipline now reside. My own judgment is that the linguistic basis of our curriculum provided the disciplines and the discipline in the prime instance ; and that with the disappearance of seriousness on the part of many of our students in this regard, the re-enforcement, the strengthening, has gone from our structure. The result of this is not just that these students are lazy about Greek and Hebrew : they are just so much slower in coming to terms with a complicated piece of Trinitarian theology or Kantian philosophy. The lack of discipline induced by the ambiguous relation in which they stand to the basic disciplines has produced what I can only call a 'fluffiness' in their attitude to other subjects. We can seek to re-introduce the discipline by insisting again upon Greek and Hebrew in fully extended form. If we *do not*, it is thoroughly unrealistic to imagine that we can retain the present structure of theological education, simply excising the Greek and Hebrew. On the contrary, if we do not locate the discipline, the re-enforcement, of our course, in the basic languages, then we have to construct a course which provides discipline in other ways.

What I am now saying is that the tension between the American and British types of theological education has been increased for us in Scotland by the disappearance of some of the structure of the Scottish system.

2. The second tension, which has entered in to create dissatisfaction with the present system, might be described as that between theology as a function of the Church and theology as an academic discipline. One of the propositions which we hear very widely repeated to-day is that theology is an activity indulged in by a small clique of eccentrics, while the main body of the Church pursues its way untheologically, priding itself on its practical efforts and its campaigns. Theology is rather something which the *Church* does *as a whole* : it is the Church's examination of her message in the light of the Word of God, her investigation of the adequacy of her language to the task of Proclamation imposed upon her by her Lord. When we add that 'Proclamation is the raw material of theology, and the Word of God the only *criterion* of its truth' then we can see clearly that the proper context of theology is the Church. It is something that can neither properly nor possibly happen except within the community of the faithful. Now this has been said so much recently—to be precise, for twenty years now—that it is bound to have an effect upon the structure that we seek to impose upon theological education.

To begin with, it is clear that on this reading of the matter theological education will have to be proportioned to the needs and standards of the Church's Life and Proclamation. There will be no doubt about the chain of command in this arrangement. It should mean at the same time, however, that the practical reference of our theological education will be a necessary part of the *total* education—not an otiose extra which we include under pressure from the Divinity Students' Committee.

At the same time as this realization on the part of theology of its nature as a function of the Church, a second thing has happened to create tension. Theology has come to have a new place within University life—as a strictly academic discipline. This has taken a variety of forms. In the Red Brick Universities which had no religious affiliation in the old days, theology has become a subject in Arts—even, as in Sydney University, which has no red bricks whatsoever, in face of a long tradition of alleged secularism in the University. Even within Universities which have had Faculties of Divinity for hundreds of years there have developed, I believe, anomalously in the Faculty of Arts (is this the American influence again ?) the subject of Divinity or Biblical Studies. This phenomenon is bound up, I am convinced, with the reinstatement of theology within the academic University disciplines. The whole attitude of the University General Council to the theological establishments is indicative of the same recognition given to our curricula.

But the implications of this situation are to my mind clear : theological education is now given a quite different frame of reference from that which it had when theology was stated to be a function of the Church. This creates a tension at all levels.

It occurs at the level of Boards of Election to Theological Chairs ; at that of our own consciences when we are drawn between service to the Church and service to the University. (By some we are thought to be far from pulling our weight in the running of Universities' affairs, in the Senior Common Room, and in presenting Christianity to undergraduates in Arts and Medicine and so on.) Tension is created perhaps most acutely for our students—very often for our best students—who recognize the claims of the Church and the University as forming an awkward ' either-or '. The tension is inevitably reflected within the four corners of our educational system, as we endeavour to reconcile not entirely compatible demands.

Now if this really is a tension, then what treatment does it require ? I am convinced that we cannot cut the knot ruthlessly and say : either that the one who pays the piper calls the tune, and that the Chairs financed solely or to a large extent by the University should serve only the University ; *or*, on the other hand, express extreme dissatisfaction with such an arrangement, and claim for the theological staff complete autonomy in the Church's name. Nor is it desirable to suggest that we offer one kind of theological educational programme within the framework of the Church, and a quite different one within that of the University. For, to be honest, the B.D. degree is related, if not actually proportioned to, the ministry, as a profession. The suggestion that within the B.D. programme we should offer a completely non-professional course is to demand more of the Faculty of Divinity than is demanded of any other Faculty. This is clear in regard to Medicine, Dentistry, Law, Science and, while it may have been not so true of the Faculty of Arts in the spacious days of our lotus-eating youth, it certainly is so now. The combinations and permutations of possible courses within the Faculty of Arts is designed not so much to satisfy the fancy of the few remaining literati who grace its Halls as to meet professional demands in teaching, commerce, industry and civil service. Once again, too, we have to oppose any serious suggestion that somehow those sections of our curriculum which have a Churchward reference are non-academic or worse still, sub-academic.

Does this mean, then, that there is really no tension between the notions that theology is a function of the Church and that theology is a non-utilitarian, non-professional discipline ? The answer is ' yes ' so long as we antithesize these two and regard them as mutually exclusive. The answer is ' no ' provided we are prepared to interpret our whole educational programme as being of a single piece. How are we to do that—how we are to define the integrating concept that is to hold together these two potentially disruptive elements is the most important question in connexion with the structure of theological education—and we shall return to it later as the topic of the fourth section of this paper. At present, the purely negative position is being held that there is no reason for continuing the tension between the two conceptions of theology.

3. The third tension in the situation is that between the ministry conceived as an order of the Church and the ministry as a function in society.

On the one hand, one of the most significant facts of the contemporary theological scene has been the rediscovery of the nature of the ministry, a rediscovery to which there has been nothing comparable in this field in the past four hundred years. This rediscovery has both inspired the inter-communion talks on the ecumenical level about the equivalence of ministries and given to these talks a definition which they would otherwise have lacked. From the Kenneth Kirk edited *Apostolic Ministry* onwards, there has been a deepening and widening awareness of what precisely the Christian ministry is : how it is related to the *shaliah* of Judaism, and to the ἀπόστολος of the New Testament ; what precise place it occupies in the pattern of the Church's existence, in relation to the laity, the eldership in our own system, and how in another system it differentiates itself in Bishops, Priests and Deacons. In these ways the Church has become much clearer than it has been for a very long time about the nature of the ministry. The renewed emphasis upon the function of proclamation within the life of the Church has also served in our denomination to accentuate the specific responsibilities of the minister within the Church.

On the other hand, the minister has found himself in a quite peculiar position not only in the Church but also in society. He is expected to make his message ' relevant ', and to do so he must have some understanding of the situation to which this ' relevance ' is to be directed. If he is performing his pastoral responsibilities, he will increasingly discover that he is required to apply the Christian ethic to a vast range of problems, which our fear of casuistry has made us avoid. And his people will expect him to make that application, and will honour him for doing so. Of course, it is right to point out that this is expected of him because of his ministerial office ; and that he will perform such pastoral counselling in the context of the gospel. But, nevertheless, in the pastoral area there arises a whole range of issues in regard to which there is no clear-cut evangelical answer. In other words, the minister discovers that he has a status in society, and is

called upon to fulfil a certain function in society which, while they are an extension in one sense of his ministerial office, are in another sense a departure from the status and function of the *shaliah* and the ἀπόστολος within the four corners of the ecclesiastical framework.

Now this kind of departure does not take place only at the level of pastoral concern. It occurs within the Church at large in so far as the Church through some of its Committees makes comments and even passes judgment upon contemporary events in the socio-economic, political and international spheres. This is an activity of the Church in which ministers are most deeply involved, and in which the initiative on the whole mostly comes from ministerial members of Assembly and of the Church. From the *theological side*, there is no doubt ample justification for such an activity; but on the secular and sociological side, it has to be said that the Church fulfils a certain function in society.

There, then, you have the ingredients of my third tension. On the one hand, what we have to say about the ministry is on the whole theologically and ecclesiastically oriented; and on the other hand this same ministry has other than theological and ecclesiastical forms of expression. Certain undesirable consequences may result from this tension: a man may neglect and deny the second element in it and withdraw into a narrow Pietism or a falsely spiritual religion: he may reject the theological conception of his office, and go for what he thinks is the realistic interpretation of the ministry. Or he may just say hard things about the staff in 121 George Street. But our students, completely aware of the ultimate tension which they will have to face after induction, find themselves in two minds about their courses in theological education.

You may say, then, that this is a further form of the basic schizophrenia at the heart of our theological educational system—between the practical and the theoretical. That is true, only so long as we realize that it is a tension created by certain novel events in our situation—and particularly by the newly discovered theological insights into the nature of the ministry and sociological, sociological even though Christian, insights into the function of the ministry in society. Therefore the problem is not just an old one in a new form; it is a new problem.

4. My fourth tension—the one which I believe really brings us to the crux of the problem and demands our immediate attention if we are to solve the other problems—is that between the kind of minister we are producing and the kind of minister which the contemporary situation requires.

You will recall that Aristotle when discussing the relation of his *Ethics* to his *Politics* stated that politics is the primary science and that in that field the decision is made as to what kind of State is to be set up and what kind of citizen is required in it. It is the task of ethics and of education to prepare men to be citizens who will take their place in that State. Different States will require different citizens, and there will be corresponding differences in the educational systems designed to produce 'the good citizen' for the different situations. An oligarchy will require a different educative process from that necessary in a democracy. In other words, education is determined by a specific τέλος, the τέλος being in turn determined by the society in which the end-term of the process is to live and think and act.

The system of theological education which we have was determined at some previous date—sometime perhaps in the late nineteenth century or very early in the twentieth—by the conceptions of the Church, of society, and of the place and function of the minister within both which obtained at that time. The end-term of the process was expected to be at home in that kind of Church and world. It is obvious that the Church, society, the ministry *and* our views of these things have changed in the past fifty years, and yet these changes have not been reflected backwards into the structure of our theological education. This is what I mean by the fourth tension—that between the kind of minister we are producing and the kind of minister which the contemporary situation requires.

The prior question in any discussion of theological education must be a question about the kind of minister we expect to have as the end-term of the process; a question, that is, about the τέλος of the system. That is a question which is not to be answered, as Aristotle pointed out, by the educators qua educators. The Church must define the kind of minister it requires in the contemporary situation. Some of us may wish to speak in that context but we do so in a different rôle. Put the matter in another way. While at the present time we have achieved very considerable definition on *the nature of the ministry*, we are comparatively very obscure about *what it is to be a minister*—in this Church, in this society, at this time. What we have to say on the former subject will greatly assist in the latter—but it does not exhaust what we have to say.

Theological education is not alone in lacking a clearly defined τέλος which will be regulative of the content and structure of the system: secondary education is in the same case. There is a deep-seated difference of opinion among educators in this field about the question of whether technical or specialized education should begin early after the 'eleven plus'; or whether education should rest on a broader cultural basis up to the fourth

year of High School. Here the quarrel is really not about actual systems of education but about the τέλος of the two systems: do we have back-room boys as the end-term of our process, the goal to which we are working; or do we hold balanced character and general culture to be the desirable qualities in the finished article?

So in respect to theological education, we must first answer the question as to the τέλος—the end-term—the kind of minister we expect to go from our Halls into the Church. Only in answering that question have we the faintest hope of restoring any valid structure to theological education. But in the answer to that question we have, I believe, the solution of the other tensions previously named; between the British and American types so-called; between theology as a function of the Church and theology as a University discipline; between the ministry as an order in the Church and the ministry as a function in society. To try to resolve any one of these tensions without beginning from some definition of the τέλος of our system is to offer a penultimate panacea—if not also to perpetuate our present distresses.

Recent Foreign Theology

The Apocalypse and History. A new Roman Catholic work on the Apocalypse expounds the thesis that we have reflected here events of the period of the Jewish War of A.D. 66–70.[1] The author, Stanislas Giet, first reviews some pages of Josephus, whose study suggested his new hypothesis to him, and then examines the Apocalypse in their light. The ten Roman emperors he identifies with the first ten emperors, but with Julius Cæsar here reckoned as the first, since Josephus, though not giving him the title of Emperor, says that he established Roman dominion over the world. He finds a reference to three of the series of ten who did not attain imperial power, and identifies these with Galba, Otho, and Vitellius, who had the title of Emperor but who did not exercise imperial authority. The tenth Emperor is then identified with Vespasian, and a chapter is devoted to the study of the imperial cult in his reign, followed by a brief examination of the Apocalypse in the light of this new hypothesis. This book will find little welcome from those who turn to the Apocalypse in the hope of learning what will happen to-morrow and the day after. It is a serious work of scholarship from which those who approach this difficult book without preconceived ideas will derive real profit.

Luke's Account of the Last Supper. The third and last part of an elaborate study of the sources of the Lucan account of the Last Supper, written by Professor H. Schürmann, has now appeared.[2] This deals with Lk 22^{21-38}, and is a linguistic and form-critical study of the same kind as the earlier parts, which have been mentioned in these columns (see THE EXPOSITORY TIMES, lxv. 223, lxviii. 159). There is the close word by word comparison with the other Synoptic accounts, with careful attention to the linguistic usage of the author of the Gospel elsewhere, and each section, devoted to but a phrase or a word, is summed up in a conclusion. The broader conclusion for the entire study is that for his account of the Last Supper Luke drew on a pre-Lucan account distinct from Mark's account. There is an Index to the entire study, including the two previously published parts.

The Messiah. A brief study of Biblical Messianism comes from the pen of G. Fohrer.[3] The author rejects the Christological understanding of the Old Testament, and equally the allegorical and typological exegesis, and says it is immaterial to our faith whether Jesus was the Messiah or not. He also rejects the cult-mythological understanding of Old Testament Messianism. Some supposedly Messianic passages he understands differently, including the Servant Songs of Deutero-Isaiah. The first four of these songs (Is 42^{1-4} 42^{5-7} 49^{1-6} 50^{4-9}) he holds to be spoken by the prophet of himself, while the last two (Is $50^{10f.}$ 52^{13}–53^{12}) he assigns to disciples of the prophet who wrote about their master. The genuinely Messianic words in the Old Testament are found to be twelve or thirteen, all post-exilic passages, and the Messianic hope is assigned a minor place in its thought. Where it is found, it is held to be a late yearning for a mortal descendant of David and reduced to national and political terms. At many points the reviewer would wish to modify all this, and especially at the easy assumption of the lateness of the Messianic passages and the interpretation of the Servant

[1] *L'Apocalypse et l'Histoire* [1957]. Presses Universitaires de France, Paris; Fr. 1200.

[2] *Jesu Abschiedsrede, Lk 22, 21–38* (*Neutestamentliche Abhandlungen*, XX. v.) [1957]. Aschendorffsche Verlagsbuchhandlung, Münster; DM. 11.80.

[3] *Messiasfrage und Bibelverständnis* [1957]. Mohr, Tübingen; DM. 3.80.

Songs. At the same time he shares Professor Fohrer's view that the Old Testament is to be studied first and foremost for itself, and not to read the New Testament back into it. In the second part of his work the author emphasizes the diversity and the unity in the Bible, and argues that the Bible is not to be viewed as the witness or record of revelation, but as Kerygma, through which we may find the contemporary Word of God when we rightly understand it.

Acts 1-7. The first seven chapters of Acts are concerned with the Jerusalem Church, whereas the rest of the Book deals with the expansion of Christianity ' in Samaria and the uttermost parts of the earth '. Professor Bo Reicke has written a detailed study of these first seven chapters in the form of a commentary on the text marked by learning and insight, and leading to the conclusion that the author of Acts made use of older traditions of the Jerusalem Church, preserving the memories of eye-witnesses.[1] This in turn supports the confidence in the historicity of the account, and in the ' relative historicity ' of the speeches. Few commentaries deal in such detail with these chapters as the treatment they get in Professor Reicke's hundred and seventy-five closely printed pages, and this monograph makes a substantial contribution to the study of the Book. In view of the claims that have sometimes been made for the influence of the Qumran sect on the Early Church, it is interesting to note the paucity of references to the Dead Sea Scrolls, though Professor Reicke is well acquainted with the Scrolls and has published important studies of them.

The Epistle to the Romans. In 1940 the late Father J. Huby published a commentary on the Epistle to the Romans in the charming series of pocket commentaries issued under the title *Verbum Salutis*. This commentary has long been out of print, and has now been published unchanged, but with nearly eighty pages of additional notes by Father S. Lyonnet.[2] Asterisks in the margin of Huby's work indicate where the additional notes belong. The volume contains an original translation of the text, and in its more than six hundred pages a substantial commentary, whose learning is matched by its lucidity. The author was well aware of the many problems surrounding the interpretation of this Epistle, and while he did not strive after novelty, as would be unfitting in a work designed for wide circulation, he shows an independence of judgment and does not slavishly follow any one of his predecessors. That it has been thought desirable to reprint his text unchanged is evidence of the esteem it had won in French Catholic circles. The additional notes, usually brief but sometimes substantial, take account of more recent work and sometimes offer a different interpretation.

Theology of the Old Testament. Books on the theology of the Old Testament will soon rival those on the Dead Sea Scrolls in number, and a discipline which a few years ago was largely ignored has now the focus of interest of scholars. Yet it is a ' discipline ' whose methodology is not yet agreed. That any modern study of the theology of the Old Testament must be marked by a historical sense, and must conserve the fruits of the study of the history of Israel's religion, would be widely agreed. Yet the problem remains how to do this without losing that sense of unity which alone can entitle us to speak of a theology of the Old Testament. Professor von Rad has now entered this field with the first volume of a work of outstanding importance,[3] in which after a preliminary survey of the history of Yahwism he proceeds to study the theology of the Old Testament section by section. It will only appear when the work is completed how far Professor von Rad finds a unity in the theology of the Old Testament, but it is clear that if he does it must be a dynamic unity, and not a static. This the reviewer has insisted more than once. No theology of the Old Testament can ignore the development that marked its stages. Von Rad studies first the theology of the Hexateuch, taking its main historical divisions separately, but with attention also to its documentary analysis. He next passes to the Davidic monarchy and the literature to which it gave rise, both in the historical writings and in the royal psalms. The concluding section of the book is devoted to the study of other psalms and Wisdom literature. For his work on the prophetic books we must await the second volume. It is already clear that this is a work which will stand alone amongst the spate of books on Old Testament theology, with an approach and a character of its own. Its scholarship is above reproach, and its spiritual penetration matches its scholarship.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester

[1] *Glaube und Leben der Urgemeinde* (*Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments*, No. 32) [1957]. Zwingli Verlag, Zürich ; Swiss Fr. 19.00.

[2] *Saint Paul : Épître aux Romains* [1957]. Beauchesne, Paris ; Fr. 1.950.

[3] *Theologie des Alten Testaments. I. Die Theologie des geschichtlichen Uberlieferungen Israels* [1957]. Kaiser Verlag, Munich ; DM. 21, or bound DM. 24.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Put out the Fire

By H. F. Mathews, M.A., Ph.D., Alsager, Cheshire

'Blessed are the peacemakers: for they shall be called sons of God.'—Mt 5^9 (R.V.).

Fire practice at school is always a bit of a lark. The mad jingling of the bell, the suppressed chuckles as everyone troops down flights of stairs to the quad., and then, finally, the appearance of the Head on the steps with a watch in his hand. 'Two minutes, fourteen and a half seconds', he announces, with rather forced dignity. It is an important part of school training, though, and secretly we know that, if a real fire did break out, the discipline would 'pay off swell' (as they say on the other side of the Atlantic).

You know (don't you?) that there are some villages in England where the fire warning sounds at exactly the same time every evening. Eight o'clock it is usually. The church bell rings out across the meadows. It is the curfew bell.

You historians know all about it. In the days of William the Conqueror—1066, and all that—everybody lived in wooden houses. If they went to bed and left the fires smouldering inside, anything might have happened. So William issued his orders. All fires in houses must be put out at bedtime. He said a bell would be rung to give people the time. It was called 'curfew', which means *couvre-feu*. And so, in some places, it has been going on ever since.

But there is something rather fine in the fact that it is the church bell that is rung. For there are fires which are more dangerous than those caused by sparks from grates. The Bible knows all about them. That very practical Epistle of James says that 'the tongue is a fire' which can kindle more wood than ever we know. Many a friendship has been wrecked by a careless word. If you whisper that the new boy is a snob, you may easily start something pretty nasty; and if you accuse someone else of cheating, you never know what may happen. It is so easy for our tongues to run away with us.

So it is good advice to 'cover the fire'. Do anything you can to stop the sparks from rising. 'Let not the sun go down upon your wrath', St. Paul said. He wasn't always working out great theological problems. He knew how important were the human problems too—like settling squabbles before dark.

Jesus taught that we have to be peace-*makers*. He knew that peace doesn't just happen in a world where we humans live. Someone has to make it. And His followers are the people who ought to be doing that every day of their lives. That is part of their job as members of God's family.

One of the most famous men in the thirteenth century was St. Thomas Aquinas, son of a nobleman, a great scholar and a brilliant teacher. But Thomas was also a humble monk. Once he was walking lost in thought in the cloisters of the great monastery at Bologna when an excited monk came up to him and told him to go with him quickly on an errand into the city. The monk had been told by the prior to find the first brother monk he could and hasten to the task. Thomas, without a word, went with him. But Thomas was lame, and could not keep up. 'Hurry up, can't you!' said the monk. Thomas did his best. The monk had no idea who the lame brother was. But presently some one stopped him and asked, 'Isn't that the great teacher, Thomas Aquinas, with you?' The monk did not know what to say. He had churlishly disturbed the greatest scholar of his day to go on a simple errand, and, moreover, had treated him harshly. In great distress, he turned to Thomas and begged his pardon. But Thomas smiled and stopped him, saying, 'No, brother; I am only sorry that I could not walk as fast as you wanted'. That is what it means to put out the fire.

Do you sing at school the hymn 'O brother man'? If so, you will know the lines:

Love shall tread out the baleful fire of anger,
And in its ashes plant the tree of peace.

The Marks

By the Reverend Principal J. Ithel Jones, M.A., B.D., The Baptist College, Cardiff

Have you ever had to write a description of yourself? Sometimes when I go away to preach I am met at the station by people who do not know me and, indeed, have never seen me. Some of them write to say that they'll be standing outside the station near a Vauxhall car, perhaps, bearing such and such a number. That makes the meeting very easy. But when this is not done I find myself having to send a description of myself. I confine myself, for safety's sake, to what I shall be wearing and, perhaps, to my height. The kind gentleman who meets me then looks out for a not-very-distinguished looking mortal of five feet nine inches wearing an Anthony Eden hat, a dark

grey belted coat and carrying a brown zipper hold-all. It's much easier for the ladies, of course. They need only mention the hat!

I am saying all this because of a rather lovely thing I read recently. A distinguished man was going to spend a short time with a friend of his in Scotland. Unfortunately the friend was not free to meet the visitor's train and had to send his man-servant along. The servant asked his master how he should recognize the visitor. 'Oh, you'll have no difficulty', replied the master, 'He's a tall gentleman and you'll find him helping somebody'.

What a wonderful way in which to be recognized. 'He'll be helping somebody.' They said of our Lord that 'He went about doing good'. If you had lived in His day and had seen a crowd of poor sick people gathered around the figure of one who spoke words of comfort and healing and ministered forgiveness, you would not have wondered who it might be.

And how good it would be if people came to know the young people of our church as those who are all-out to help others.

The Christian Year

FOURTH SUNDAY AFTER EASTER

Our Christian Hope

BY THE REVEREND PRINCIPAL CHARLES S. DUTHIE, D.D., EDINBURGH

'Be ready always to give an answer to every man that asketh you a reason of the hope that is in you with meekness and fear.'—I P 3^{15}.

'Always be prepared to make a defense to any one who calls you to account for the hope that is in you, yet do it with gentleness and reverence' (R.S.V.).

Isn't part of our trouble to-day that very few outside the Church ever ask us Christians to give a reason for the hope within us?

Our situation seems rather different from that of the first Christians. The outside world could not help asking them questions, for they declared that God Himself had come to earth in Jesus of Nazareth; and their beliefs were reinforced by an entirely new style of living. To-day Christian faith is dismissed as conventional or irrelevant. It does not provoke the great questions. It is the scientist, with his strange new power, or the Communist, with his dream of a world society, who is more often asked to give a reason for his hope. What irritates and disables us is the feeling that the outsider does not take us seriously enough to engage in a real conversation. His indifference is harder to bear than hostility.

What can we Christians do about this? Must we not recognize that there are times when we have to be prepared to wait for men to come to us with the big questions about life and destiny? Patience is not a sign of weakness but of strength. It often happens that the Christian meets a man who needs the stabilizing power of faith; but little headway is made because that man has not yet been shaken into an awareness of his own need. We cannot force the Bread of Life upon men until they have begun to show some signs of hunger

Yet that is only half the story. Patience is needed, but patience is not enough. *If men are not yet hungry, the Church must make them hungry.* By the preaching of the gospel, by the quality of her fellowship, by the depth of her concern and by her sacrificial action the Church must compel men to come and ask for the secret of the life that animates her people. Just there is the rub! A kindly critic of the Church has written 'A Church gathers about it the congregation it deserves, and the congregation of the Church to-day does not represent the best and most courageous elements of the people either in a moral or an intellectual or a spiritual sense'. Whether we agree with this judgment or not, we must surely agree with the same writer when he says that the primary task of the Church is not to conserve but to create. The Church is in the world to create that authentic quality of living—a life lived out of gratitude and in the spirit of commitment through the power of God—which draws men to itself and then beyond itself to the Christ who makes it possible. When an unbeliever comes into a Christian community he should detect immediately in its worship and fellowship a distinctive reality that commands and restrains him. He should be struck by nothing less than the presence of Almighty God.

What is it that the Christian has to share with other men? Our text makes one aspect of it very plain. He has to be able and ready to give a reason for the hope that is in him. Peter does not say 'a reason for the *faith* that is in you', although that is how the verse is often misquoted, nor 'a reason for the love that is in you', though an account of faith and love would undoubtedly lead back to God and to what He has done for men. He chooses the second of Paul's great triad of faith, *hope* and love. When the New Testament writers use the word 'hope' they mean by it the firm and well-grounded confidence that God will do His part. The significance of this hope was inseparable from the forward look to the swiftly approaching hour when God would vindicate His people and bring the tale of history to a triumphant end.

While we may not be able to follow those early Christians in believing that historically the end of the world is round the next corner, we can see that their confident hope about a speedy triumph of the Kingdom of God was in reality an expression

of their trust in God. Their expectation may have been disappointed in the precise form which it took, but at the heart of this expectation lay the profound conviction that this world belongs to God, that He made it, sustains it and will lead it to its goal.

That conviction was never more needed than to-day. God's purpose abides, whatever follies we commit. We have a Kingdom that cannot be shaken by the worst calamity that man may inflict upon himself. The basis of this expectation and hope is Christ Himself. He is within us as 'the hope of glory'. For it was through Christ that this world was made and it is through Him that its redemption will be consummated. This Christ is the Christ who lives in His people. As we allow Him to reign within us we grow more confident of His reign in all the world. In the last resort it is Christ our Hope to whom we Christians point every inquirer.

The privilege of being ready to give a reason for our hope in Christ is a privilege conferred on *every man.* It is not the prerogative of the expert, whether he be minister, teacher or theologian. We must all be ready to give an answer to every man, *because it is only right that as Christians we should know where we stand.* An unexamined hope, like an unexamined life, is not worth having. Indeed it is not until we begin to talk with others about what is precious to us that we come to know whether our grasp of the Christian realities is weak or strong. Moreover what we hold dear is enhanced by the act of sharing it. I remember talking to a girl in a railway compartment. We discussed the weather, politics, holidays, life at the University. In the end, very naturally, we came round to religion. I discovered she was a seeker. But I also discovered that because the conversation was real, the religious words like faith, God, Christ, which we use so glibly, had a more authentic ring than ever. Do we ever really give without receiving?

We must be prepared to give our Christian answer, in the second place, *because it is undeniable that this is the way in which Christianity has been transmitted ever since Andrew brought Peter to Jesus.* Faith moves from man to man. 'One loving heart sets another on fire.' Do you find, as I do, that when you look back on your life the decisive influences have been exerted on you not so much by Christian books as by Christian men? Milton was right when he spoke of a great book as the life-blood of a master spirit; but that blood cannot achieve in print what it accomplishes as it flows through the veins of the living man, whose word is in your ear, whose hand is on your shoulder, whose knees are bent for you in prayer. A dozen simple words spoken out of the depth of a life sincerely given to God can often effect more than the finest apologetic argument. In this vital communication of truth every one has a part to play.

We have a third reason for being eager to share our Christian hope. *We Christians have the best of all good news to give to those who seek.* It is not so much our knowledge of Christ that we share as the Christ whom we know, the Christ who is given to our experience but who far trancends it. In giving a reason for the hope we have in Christ we communicate Christ our hope. For it is the function of everything that bears the Christian name—whether it be the Christian Bible or the Christian Church or the Christian man—to be an arrow, a signpost, a finger that points away from itself to Him.

Finally we have to be ready to give our answer with meekness and fear, with gentleness and reverence. With gentleness and reverence! becase in the very act of giving it we know that we are unworthy of a privilege which is sheer grace, because the men to whom we speak must not be bludgeoned into believing but persuasively wooed and won, and, most of all, because this is the only fitting way to present to the world the Christ whose humble approach to His human brothers was the way of the cradle and the Cross.

ROGATION SUNDAY

The Argument from Silence

BY THE REVEREND R. WATSON MATHEWSON, B.D., S.T.M., EDINBURGH

'If it were not so, I would have told you.'—Jn 14^{2}.

Part of the difficulty of this text is typographical. Scholars have not made up their minds as to how the phrase was originally punctuated. Did it read as in our Authorised Version—'If it were not so, I would have told you', or did it read as in the Revised Standard Version, 'if it were not so, would I have told you that I go to prepare a place for you?' Both Versions contain valuable insights into the character of Jesus, the first into His considerateness, the second into His honesty. Scholars are not agreed as to which is the correct rendering so we can still accept the old familiar version.

But there is another difficulty, not typographical this time but verbal. The very words are riddle-like, stretching the mind. 'If it were not so, I would have told you.' Here is a complex form of argument and one that we don't often use, *the argument from silence.* If such and such were not the case I would not have kept quiet.

Sometimes as much can be gathered from what a man does not say as from what he does, and in

this regard the silences of Jesus are most instructive, because they were obviously intentional.

1. About certain truths He was silent, for instance, because *He wanted men to find them out for themselves*. Jesus wanted the truth about Himself to come home to men by personal discovery. You don't find Him saying for instance, in so many words, I am the Messiah. He would not say it to the Pharisees who wanted a definite statement. He would not even say it to His disciples. He waited for that moment when their experience of living with Him would carry its own conviction. That moment came when Simon Peter made his tremendous confession, 'Thou art the Christ'. And it is still true that no authoritative proclamation will ever convince us of His divinity. Only the experiment of living with Him and serving Him and praying in His name as if His claims *were* true will eventually authenticate them beyond all doubting.

2. So also He remains silent when it comes to the *details* of life in human society; he wants us to *work* these out for ourselves. If we are looking to Him for guidance on specific political and economic problems we will look in vain. Guiding principles, not detailed instructions, are His concern.

3. Then, again, there are other truths about which He has nothing to say because we are *not yet capable of receiving them*. 'I have yet many things to say unto you', He said to His disciples on their last night together before the Crucifixion, 'but ye cannot bear them now.' In history as well as in our own lives God reveals Himself only progressively. That means that what He has told us up to date is enough for us to live on as the Lord's disciples. We can look forward in this life and in the life to come to development.

4. But we cannot overlook the fact that there are still other truths about which He is silent, because *we do not want to receive them*. Eventually to Pilate's questions, we are told, Jesus answered not a word. He had answered willingly so long as the man's mind was open and really hesitating. But as soon as Jesus perceived that Pilate had made his cowardly decision, He had nothing more to say. His silence was His last appeal and His judgment. And there comes a time when Christ may have no more to say to us until we stop refusing to follow the clear guidance He has already given.

5. But there are still other truths about which He says nothing because *we already know them*. It is to these, I feel, that our text in particular refers. The disciples had certain basic assumptions about life and death and eternity. Jesus made no attempt to correct these because fundamentally they were sound. 'If it were not so, I would have told you.' This may seem dangerous teaching. It may seem to suggest that simply because Christ has not repudiated them, He acquiesces in all the fanciful or superstitious convictions that establish themselves from time to time in our minds. If we use this text too spaciously we land ourselves in that danger. 'And yet', as J. S. Stewart says, 'on the other hand there are yearnings and expectations very deeply established in our hearts which do seem to be covered by this assurance.'

(1) The assumption, for instance, that there is a God at all. We have no definite proof of His existence. It is true there is evidence of Him in the world He has made, and in the characters of human beings. Just as an artist shows himself in his pictures, so the traces of a Divine architect appear in natural things and men are driven to say, 'The heavens and the earth declare His glory'.

And much more, on occasion, He seems to be mirrored in *man*—not man in the abstract but the individual men and women beside whom we live or work or play. It is the unexpected acts of kindness or unselfishness, and the rarer acts of real sacrifice and almost heroism that for a moment reflect the face of God, so that we know what the Bible means when it says, 'God made man in his own image'.

So the assumption that God exists is not a Christian one only; since traces of Him are visible to all men the assumption is universal. But there are no proofs to support it. Jesus never argued for the existence of God. He accepted the universal assumption and He made it the starting point of His revelation of God's nature. 'Ye *believe* in God', He said, 'believe also in me.'

It is late in the day for most of us to be reviewing this first of all religious beliefs, but it is never inopportune for us to allow our wonder to be revived at the fact of this unseen Creator. He who hath no awe of God, said one of the saints, hath no God.

(2) Another assumption we make is that prayer is of value. Most people, the world over, turn almost involuntarily to prayer in moments of need or distress, or thankfulness or high resolve. Often the non-Christian in his devoutness puts the Christian to shame—but there it is, this universal assumption that somehow prayer with its structure of confession, and thanksgiving and intercession is of value.

Again we look in vain to Jesus for any proof of the reasonableness of prayer. He never argued its validity. But He certainly practised it. He practised it as one for whom it was life's ultimate necessity. The unanswerable argument for prayer is *there* if you like, the argument of the Son of God's own prayer life—but an argument not put into words.

(3) There is a final human assumption in which our Lord supports us, the assumption that this life is not all. Again this belief is universal. It was primitive man's innate conviction that beyond this world there lay another that led him to use stone for sepulchres before he used it for houses.

Yes, the assumption of a future life is reasonable enough; it is rooted in our essential natures as immortal beings. But it is still only an assumption. And if we are looking for proofs of the reality and nature of heaven we will look in vain to Jesus. Only this once did He give His disciples a glimpse of the country to which He was going. He had just told them that He was going to leave them—and their hearts were filled with sorrow. To help them He lifted the curtain a fraction. He showed them the homeliness of death to those who trusted the love of God. Those who are at home with God are under one roof, whether they live in this world or in the world to come; and in this great house of God Christ Himself prepares a room for them and leads them to it.

So Jesus gives us this special assurance to reinforce the truth we already know in our hearts. We are right in believing that death is not an end but an entrance. We are right in believing that nothing, not even death, can separate us from the Father's love. Jesus tells us here again to trust our own hearts. If this were the only place, if this life were all, He would have said so.

Well, these are some of the truths that we can safely deduce from the silences of Jesus. But most particularly they demonstrate to us that He has told us all we really need to know. He has given us light enough for our daily journey in His company, and in that light of life we can walk, joyfully, till travelling days are done.

SUNDAY AFTER ASCENSION

The Purpose of the Ascension

BY THE REVEREND JOHN R. GRAY, V.R.D., B.D., TH.M., GLASGOW

'He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things.'—Eph 4^{10}.

'There's one thing, at least, you never preach above our heads.' In that kind of remark one may sometimes detect the suggestion that one could not, even if one tried. However intended, the remark is really a compliment, for the gospel is not aimed above our heads, but at our hearts, yes, and at our hands and our feet. It is meant for the world, the absolutely real world. Christ's work does not lie only, or even primarily, in the sphere of the Church. It is being done just as much in police court, kitchen, factory or hospital. His will is to be sought not nearly so much in the abstract as in the perfectly concrete situations in which we find ourselves.

It cannot be too often said that the Christian and the Christian Church are necessarily, inescapably, involved in the world. We dare not withdraw from the needs of our fellows (even if our souls become somewhat rubbed and soiled by our contacts with them). The Christian gospel is quite literally 'down to earth'. On the other hand, life in this world is not an end in itself. The world is not self-sufficient. There is more to Christianity than all this earth can contain. Our faith is finally other-worldly.

1. So our text is a reminder that the same Christ who descended into the world also ascended up far above all heavens, and that until He did so He had not fulfilled the purpose of the Father. Until He did so, He could not fill all things. We cannot rejoice in Christmas-time except in the light of Good Friday and Easter, Ascensiontide and Whitsunday. The body of Christian theology is one and indivisible. There is no such thing as a theology of the Incarnation—not a Christian theology of the Incarnation, at any rate. The Incarnation of itself is not good news. It is bad news. So long as God was in heaven there was hope; but if God came down here and remained here, then our hopes have been turned to despair. A God wholly contained in this world is not a God who can save. We need a God involved in His world but rising above it that we may rise too. The most elementary rule of life-saving at sea is 'Do not become involved in the same predicament as the person you would seek to rescue from drowning'. Before one jumps in, one should secure a line to one's own body or take some other appropriate action. Otherwise the would-be rescuer brings not help and hope but only further peril, or at the best companionship in despair.

Christ could not begin to help until He came down amongst us. He could not finish helping us until He returned whence He came. 'He that descended is the same also that ascended.'

2. What is true of Christ is true also of His Church. It is right for the Church to be concerned with slums and education, old folks' homes, 'H'-bombs and all the rest, but it is only right if it views these things against the background of eternity. It is right that the Church should pray for the State and its government, but it must be ready also to challenge and sometimes in the name of God to condemn the action of the State.

The Church itself, of course, is involved in the world. As an institution of this world it must have rules and laws and offices and officials. But we must beware lest we regard these things, the external forms of the Church, as the Church itself. Christ has His own in every age and in every clime.

They exist inside every church, the leaven in the lump. For them the Church is not an external thing, for them the Church is Christ. The Church must have government—Episcopal, Presbyterian or Congregational—but it must have government. Yet however governed, its real head is Christ alone.

> The Lamb which dwells amidst the throne
> shall o'er them still preside ;
> Feed them with nourishment divine,
> and all their footsteps guide.

We may have to begin with the external things, with the minutiae of church services, church government, church schemes and so on, but unless we finish with the Risen and Ascended Christ, we have missed the whole point of the external organization. The end of the Church militant is the Church triumphant in heaven under its Risen and Ascended Head.

3. Christ descended and ascended. The Church, while condescending to the meanest and most humdrum details of the life of the world and its own life, must also for ever be ascending. And so must we. Life is a climb. ' I return ', said Christ, ' to your Father and to My Father, to your God and My God ', and ' I will come again that where I am there ye may be also '. But how ? Christ went lower than the world. The Creed says, ' He was dead, and buried. He descended into hell '. He went as far down as a man could go and so He has been raised far above all heavens and given a Name that is above every Name. Down, deep down, went Christ that He might be raised up, and if we would follow Him whither He has gone we must share His humiliation and His Cross. When a child is born into the world we rejoice, although in some sort we all believe that he has come from heaven and has, by the very fact of being born, a share in our fallen nature. Why we can rejoice is because we believe that our babes are meant for something more than seventy years of toil and sorrow and increasing weakness and final death. We can rejoice because they who bear the image of our earthly also shall bear the image of the heavenly. Only heaven makes sense of earth. Saintly Samuel Rutherford, than whom no one was more thoroughly involved in the affairs of the Scotland of his day, could still say about the world, ' fie, fie, this is not like my country '. All things must be judged in the light of their end, and so must we. Not descent but ascension was Christ's final step and it shall be ours. We don't know much about heaven, at least I don't, but this one thing I know, Christ our Lord shall be there and we shall be filled with all His fullness. As St. John said, ' Beloved, now are we the sons of God, and it doth not yet appear what we shall be : but we know that, when he shall appear, we shall be like him ; for we shall see him as he is '.

Down through the ages men of faith utterly involved in this sinful world, battling with the imperfections of the Church, and their own sin, have guided their course through life by the light of heaven ; have kept direction and heart and hope in prospect of glories yet to be revealed. They were sure that God will perfect what in mercy He has begun. Looking at the Jesus of Nazareth, the Christ of Calvary and the Lord of the empty tomb, they have looked beyond these to the Ascended One, and so have been led to the conviction ' He that descended is the same also that ascended up far above all heavens that he might fill all things '. And He shall. The best is yet to be—Lift up your hearts.

WHITSUNDAY

Except by the Holy Spirit

BY THE REVEREND OWEN E. EVANS, M.A., B.D., MANCHESTER

' No one can say " Jesus is Lord " except by the Holy Spirit.'—1 Co 12^3 (R.S.V.).

The whole burden of Paul's argument in chs. 12–14 of this Epistle is that every true Christian, whether or not he possesses the more public and spectacular gifts (such as prophecy and speaking with tongues) which the Corinthians were so prone to covet, has received the Holy Spirit. The Spirit is no respecter of persons ; He honours all alike within the Christian community ; inspiration is not the monopoly of any particular group or groups of church members.

It is precisely this emphasis that we find in our text. The short, simple formula ' Jesus is Lord ' was the earliest form of the Christian confession of faith, and was repeated by every convert as he took his first decisive step along the road of Christian discipleship. Thus Paul is saying in effect that no one can take even the first step on the Christian way without the inspiration and guidance of the Holy Spirit. The fundamental *faith* of the Christian is a mark (just as the graces and virtues of the Christian *character* are marks—see ch. 13) of the inspiration of the Spirit—no less clearly so than are the phenomena of prophecy or speaking with tongues.

Now everyone who, seriously and sincerely, utters the confession ' Jesus is Lord ' thereby does three things. (1) He gives expression to a *creed*. (2) He performs an act of *worship*. (3) He takes an oath of *loyalty*. This means that a Christian is a person who believes something definite about Jesus Christ, who worships Jesus Christ, and who lives and dies in loyalty to Jesus Christ. Let us consider each of these three aspects of the confession.

1. *The confession as the expression of a creed.* The title 'Lord' was a recognized Divine title throughout the religious world of the first century A.D. It was applied to the deities of the Hellenistic mystery cults; when Caesar claimed for himself divine status he adopted the title *Dominus et Deus*; and the Greek *Kyrios* is used in the Greek version of the Old Testament to represent the Divine Name of the Hebrew Scriptures. In view of all this, it is clear that the Church's confession of Jesus as Lord amounted to a claim that He was Divine. It was an unambiguous declaration of belief concerning the Person of Jesus Christ.

This belief in the divinity of Christ's Person is the essential basis of the whole Christian Creed and of all Christian doctrine. The World Council of Churches testified to this truth when it adopted, at Amsterdam in 1948, as its credal basis the formula, 'We acknowledge Jesus Christ as God and Saviour'. Here is the confession which unites all Christian people, at a level deeper than that of all the traditional and denominational differences that may separate them. There may well be room, within the fellowship of the Universal Church, for differences of viewpoint and emphasis on many matters relating to belief and doctrine, but there can be no room for difference on this fundamental affirmation of the divinity of Jesus Christ. Here all who call themselves Christians must surely be of one mind and heart.

The point I would specially emphasize here, however, is that before any one can attain to such belief he must be inspired by the Holy Spirit. Many persons of undoubted honesty and integrity hesitate to commit themselves to joining in the full Christian confession, insisting that they cannot do so until their *reason* has been fully convinced of its truth. Such intellectual honesty commands respect, but we need to point out to such people that their reason will not, and cannot, be convinced of the truth about Jesus Christ until it is enlightened by the Holy Spirit Himself, who alone can take the things of Christ and declare them to men. The 'flesh and blood' of unaided human reason is incapable of apprehending the truth concerning Christ's Person (cf. Mt 16^{17}).

> No man can truly say
> That Jesus is the Lord,
> Unless Thou take the veil away,
> And breathe the living word.

The Holy Spirit alone can enable a man to know Jesus for who He is, and so to confess Him as Lord and God.

2. *The confession as an act of worship.* When a man really comes to believe in Jesus Christ as Lord and God, the inevitable consequence for that man is to worship Christ. So it happened in the Early Church, and a study of primitive Christian forms of worship, as seen in the New Testament, would reveal that the confession 'Jesus is Lord' was as central to the Church's worship as it was to its doctrine.

Our text thus suggests the vital truth that no one can truly worship Christ except he be guided and inspired by the Holy Spirit. 'God is Spirit', says the classic text on Christian worship (Jn 4^{24}), 'and they that worship him must worship him in spirit and truth'; but to worship 'in spirit and truth' is only possible to those whose hearts and minds and souls are open to the gracious influences of Him whom St. John elsewhere calls 'the Spirit of truth'. We must never forget that worship is not an activity to be engaged in in any careless, casual or unprepared manner. It is a solemn and sacred act, before engaging in which (whether in public or private) we need always to invoke the illumination, guidance and power of the Holy Spirit, as does the familiar Collect which includes the words: 'Cleanse the thoughts of our hearts by the inspiration of thy Holy Spirit, that we may perfectly love thee, and worthily magnify thy holy name'.

No one can say 'Jesus is Lord' in an act of worship, except by the Holy Spirit.

3. *The confession as an oath of loyalty.* For to confess Jesus Christ as Lord involves more than the expression of a belief about Him and the offering of formal worship to Him. It means nothing less than to recognize and acknowledge His unconditional claim upon our loyalty and service. The word 'Lord' on the one hand (as used in the first century) implies the word 'bond-servant' on the other. To address Jesus as Lord is to own oneself His slave; it is to take a solemn and sacred oath, upon which one promises to serve Him loyally and unswervingly.

The first Christians were well aware of this, and they never treated lightly this oath which they had taken. They treated it with the utmost seriousness, even when that involved privation, torture, imprisonment, and death itself. What was the secret of this shining, fearless, unswerving loyalty displayed by those early Christians? There can only be one answer, and it is summed up in these words of the second-century writer who wrote the moving *Epistle to Diognetus*: 'Do you not see them flung to the wild beasts, to make them deny their Lord, and yet unconquered? . . . These things do not look like the achievements of man; they are the power of God; they are the proofs of His presence.' No one can say 'Jesus is Lord' as an oath of loyalty, and remain faithful—unto death itself—to that oath, except by the Holy Spirit.

And so, on this anniversary of Pentecost, let us pray, fervently and expectantly, that God will

baptize us and our fellow-Christians throughout the world in our day, with a fresh outpouring of His Holy Spirit, that we may recognize and know Jesus Christ, in ever fuller measure, as Lord and God; that we may worship Him constantly and devotedly; and that we may follow and serve Him in complete obedience and loyalty all the days of our life.

Entre Nous

Real Life

It has been truly said that the motto of Christian preaching should be *Non nova sed nove*. The Christian preacher does not say new things, but he must ever be seeking to say the old things in a new way, so that that which is already known may become alive as a new discovery. *Existence under God*, by Dr. Albert Edward Day (Abingdon Press; $2.50) is a book which admirably succeeds in that task.

The thesis of the book is this: 'Not every pianist can be a Paderewski, not every artist a Raphael, not every philosopher a Plato, not every preacher a Phillips Brooks. A variety of gifts and talents are necessary in a functioning society and are inevitable in a world where heredity and environment determine some limits beyond which an individual cannot pass. But one gift I am sure God has given to all—a capacity to enter into fellowship with Him. If we have not done so, it is not because we are incapable, but because we have not wisely and determinedly trained our consciousness for the task.' Arnold Toynbee said: 'Any soul can meet God at any time and in any place in any historical circumstance'.

In pursuit of this thesis Dr. Day divides his book into three parts. There is the *Discovery* that this is so. There is the *Dialogue* with God which ensues when we realize that we can meet God. And there is the *Deliverance* which results when we are in real fellowship with God.

The *Discovery* is something that we must make. Gabriel Marcel speaks of the difference 'between conformity to principle and faithfulness to a presence'. Berdyaev reminds us that 'the meaning of the coming of Christ into the world lies in a real transformation of human nature. . . . In Christianity the central idea is that of transfiguration, not justification.'

The *Dialogue* with God is prayer, and real prayer is not easy. Real prayer is discipline. 'It is not a hurried visit to the window of a religious drive-in restaurant for a moral sandwich or a cup of spiritual stimulant, but an unhurried communion with God, who is never in a hurry. It is not merely the expression of a transient mood of dependence or loneliness but the consistent cry of one who seeks to perceive and express the Ultimate Beauty. It is the antithesis of dilly-dally devotions, drowsy murmurs from a pillow where sleep lies in wait, the lazy lisping of familiar phrases that should shake one to the core of one's being. It is the find-or-die outreach of the soul for God.' Father Andrew said: 'It is much easier to talk about God than to talk to God'.

In this discipline the mind must be used. 'The condition for the discovery of God is not pious imbecility.' It is quite true that thinking reaches a limit, and quiet waiting must take its place, but it is also true that 'irrationalism and irrelevance will raise a curtain between us and Him'. Evelyn Underhill repudiates the 'notion in the air that when a man turns to God he ought to leave his brains behind him'.

After the *Discovery* and the *Dialogue* there comes the *Deliverance*. Here Dr. Day has an extremely interesting analysis of Jesus' healing methods. (1) Jesus made a very skilful use of suggestion: for example in the case of Bartimaeus and of the cripple at the Pool of Bethesda. (2) Jesus sought to remove the factors which caused the disease: for example sin—'Your sins are forgiven you'; neurotic choice of illness—'Will you be made whole?'; self-centredness—'If any man will come after me, let him deny himself.' (3) Jesus brought to every situation the tremendous therapeutic power of love. Wherever He was present, perfect love was present. (4) Jesus Himself was psychically healthy. No one with a diseased and disintegrated mind can cure some one else with such a mind. Jesus' own personality was a perfect harmony. (5) Jesus was one with God and full of confidence in God. His whole attitude was such as to inspire faith in those who needed help. (6) Jesus was spiritually alive. The spiritual outlook of the doctor or the nurse has its inevitable effect on the patient. The attitude of Jesus was such that it necessarily brought life.

The value of Dr. Day's book is that it will help a man to help himself, and thus to help others. The preacher who prayerfully reads this book will emerge, not only with new sermon material, but with new material to build up his own spiritual life.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.